School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1336853

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY



# The Library

## SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA


Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024

https://archive.org/details/marksmemoirsofje0000jame

John Rae
Colnburn

*BY THE SAME AUTHOR,*

A CRITICAL EXPOSITION OF THE THIRD CHAPTER OF PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS. 12s. 6d.

MATTHEW'S MEMOIRS OF JESUS CHRIST: A COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW. Third Edition, 15s.

SAVING FAITH: OR THE FAITH, BY WHICH THE SINNER IS CONSCIOUSLY UNITED TO THE SAVIOUR, PRACTICALLY CONSIDERED. Tenth Thousand, 1s. 6d.

[For literary notices see end of the volume.]

---

*Preparing for the Press.*

A COMMENTARY ON PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

5585
M62

# MARK'S MEMOIRS OF JESUS CHRIST:

# A COMMENTARY

ON

# THE GOSPEL ACCORDING

TO

# MARK.

BY

JAMES MORISON, D.D.

LONDON: HAMILTON, ADAMS, & CO.
GLASGOW: THOMAS D. MORISON.
1873.

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

# CONTENTS.


PAGE

PREFACE, . . . . . ix—xi

INTRODUCTION, . . . . . xiii—lxxxiii

§. 1. GOSPEL AND GOSPELS, . . . . . xiii

§. 2. THE TITLE OF MARK'S GOSPEL, . . . . . xiii

§. 3. THE NAME "MARK," . . . . . xv

§. 4. WAS MARK THE EVANGELIST THE JOHN MARK OF *the Acts of the Apostles?* . . . . . xvi

§. 5. COVERT REFERENCE TO THE EVANGELIST IN THE BODY OF THE GOSPEL, . . . . . xix

§. 6. THE RELATION OF THE APOSTLE PETER TO THE GOSPEL: PATRISTIC EVIDENCE, . . . . . xx—xxxiv

(1.) Testimony of Jerome, . . . . . xx

(2.) Testimony of Epiphanius, . . . . . xxi

(3.) Testimony of Eusebius, . . . . . xxi

PAGE

(4.) Testimony of Origen, . . . . . xxii

(5.) Testimony of Tertullian, . . . . . xxii

(6.) Testimony of Clemens of Alexandria, . . . . xxiii

(7.) Testimony of Irenæus, . . . . . xxiv

(8.) Testimony of Justin Martyr, . . . . . xxvii

(9.) Testimony of Papias, . . . . . xxix

§. 7. Relation of the Gospel to the Apostle Peter: internal Evidence, . . . . . xxxiv—xxxviii

§. 8. The Genetic Relation of the Gospel to the Synoptic Gospels of Matthew and Luke, . . . xxxviii—lxiii

Augustin's theory, or *the footman-hypothesis*, . . . . xxxviii

Griesbach's theory, or *the pendulum-hypothesis*, . . . xli

Dr. Henry Owen, . . . . . xlv

The Tübingen School, . . . . . xlvi

Ewald's theory, . . . . . xlviii

Gaussen's solution, . . . . . xlix

The Eichhorn theory, or *the Urevangelium-hypothesis*, . . l

The 'Mark-hypothesis,' . . . . . lv

General observations on the problem, . . . . . lviii

Gieseler's hypothesis, . . . . . lxii

§. 9. Date of the Gospel, . . . . . lxiii—lxix

Common view, . . . . . lxiii

Patrizi, Storr, Birks, . . . . . lxv

Volkmar, . . . . . lxvi

Tübingen School, . . . . . lxvi

Data for approximative date, . . . . . lxviii

PAGE

§. 10. The Place of the Gospel's Publication, and the Language in which it was originally written, . lxix—lxxi

§. 11. The Plan, Aim, and Style of the Gospel, . . lxxi—lxxv

§. 12. Integrity of the Gospel, . . . . . lxxv

§. 13. The Topical Position of the Gospel in the Group of Gospels, . . . . . lxxv

§. 14. The Contents of the Gospel, . . . . lxxvi—lxxxiii

Exposition of the Gospel, . . . . . 1—492

Index to the Exposition, . . . . . 493—506

# PREFACE.

THE following *Commentary on the Gospel according to Mark*, though latently complementive of the author's *Commentary on the Gospel according to Matthew*, is yet entirely 'self-contained.' There are, indeed, occasional references to some fuller discussions or expositions in the *Commentary on Matthew*; but the thread of continuous exposition in Mark is never suspended or broken off. The author conceives that he was not entitled to postulate the reader's possession of the earlier volume; and he imagines that it would have been a blunder in the structure of his present work, had it imposed, even on those readers who possess the companion-volume, the irksome task of turning to it, and turning it up, ere they could ascertain his opinion on any particular passage in Mark.

In thus endeavouring to avoid a 'rock,' on which many of his predecessors in the exposition of the Gospels had struck, the author was not unmindful that there was a little mälstrom-like 'Charybdis,' on the other side of 'Scylla,' no less dangerous to navigators. Hence he has been on his guard not to allow any of the materials which have done duty in the *Commentary on Matthew*, to float silently away into the whirlpool of circulatory repetition, in order to do double service, in expounding the coincident representations in Mark. He hopes that whatever else his readers may miss in the present volume, they will find throughout fresh veins of representation and illustration,—the result of fresh labour and research.

In *Mark's Gospel*, moreover, there is a pervading peculiarity of phraseology,—inartificial, indeed, yet idiosyncratic,—which, to the lover of delicate tints and flickers of presentation,

affords a continual incentive to fresh investigation. Hence, in truth, much of the charm, as also much of the difficulty, in expounding Mark. The charm is intensified, if the conviction can be substantiated,—as it undoubtedly can, provided the sum of the existing evidence be impartially weighed,—that Peter's teaching, within the circle of the early catechumens, was the chief fountain-head, from which Mark drew the substance, and even the minutiæ, of his Gospel. The flicker of Peter's subjective conceptions is thus passing before us as we read. It is a fact fitted to stimulate. We feel as if we should not like to let slip any of that subtle essence, or quintessence of mind, which made the primary observations of the chief of the Lord's personal attendants distinctive as well as distinct, and his subsequent reminiscences and representations invariably vivid and frequently picturesque.

Whether attributable to Peter's tenacity of memory, or to that unique element in his dialect which made his manner of speech, like that of every other original mind, peculiarly his own, or whether merely attributable to the reproductive idiosyncrasy of the writer, "vexed expressions" abound in Mark, and give ample scope for patient, yet exciting, research. There is for instance a remarkable expression in chapter vii, 3, giving occasion for three varieties of rendering in the margin of our English Bibles; another in chapter ix, 23, completely veiled in our English Translation; another of great peculiarity in chapter ix, 49, of such a character that it could not be veiled in any translation whatsoever; another in chapter xiv, 3, veiled in a false translation, borrowed from the Vulgate; another in chapter xiv, 41, which no mere English reader could ever have suspected; and another still in chapter xiv, 72, where happily our English translators penetrated the true meaning of the phrase.

There are, besides, many other "vexed" statements and phrases, which help to keep the critic from yielding, so readily as he might otherwise have done, to the proclivity to "nod" with "good Homer." See, for instance, chapters ii, 23;

ii, 26; iii, 17; vii, 4; viii, 26; ix, 13; xvi, 13; and, above all, chapter xi, 13, "for the time of figs was not yet."

There are "vexed" questions in addition, belonging to the department of *Introduction*, as distinguished from *Exposition*. In particular, there is the question of *the genetic inter-relationship of the three Synoptic Gospels*,—a subject around which a peculiarly thorny and "vexatious" thicket, or rather forest of literature, has, during the past eighty or ninety years, been growing up. Into this forest the Expositor is invited to enter, the moment he passes from one to another of the Synoptic narratives; and hence the discussion of the question becomes appropriate, if not imperative, in the *Introduction to Mark*. The appropriateness, at all events, is all the greater in consequence of the zeal, both literary and dogmatic, with which, of late years, a peculiar theory has been ventilated,—the theory that *Mark's Gospel* is the principal "source" of both *the Gospel according to Matthew* and *the Gospel according to Luke*. This theory has been called, by way of eminence, "the Mark-hypothesis" *(die Marcushypothese)*.

In the discussion of *the genetic inter-relationship of the Synoptic Gospels*, principles and facts naturally come forward for manipulation, which have a vital relation to the theory of David F. Strauss, on the one hand, concerning the mythical nature of *the Gospel-History*, and the complementive theory of Ferdinand C. Baur, on the other, in reference to the late production and consequent historical untrustworthiness of *the Gospel-Writings*. The postulates of both these theories are, as the author conceives, unhistorical and unreal.

Florentine Bank House,
Glasgow, *Feb.* 14, 1873.

# INTRODUCTION

## TO THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO

# MARK.

### §. 1. Gospel and Gospels.

It is a matter of interest and significance, that, in the Biblical Records, we have not only *gospel* but *Gospels*.

We have *gospel*, running like a golden thread through the whole Bible, connecting history, precept, proverb, prophecy, and binding the entire constituents of "the volume of the Book" into unity. We should certainly have had no Bible at all, had there been no *gospel*.

But in particular portions of the progressive revelation, the golden gospel line becomes doubled as it were, or trebled, or multiplied in some still higher ratio. Sometimes, also, there is in addition to the multiplication of "line upon line," a rich and varied design flowering out into beauty—"the beauty of holiness." The whole texture of certain paragraphs or larger sections gleams and glows with *gospel*. Such, for instance, are the Messianic Psalms. Such is the Fifty-third Chapter of Isaiah: it is emphatically *the Gospel according to Isaiah*. And such, of course, are the four Gospels of the New Testament. The *gospel* is so efflorescent in these *Gospels*, that the lovers of the Bible have, from a very early period of the Christian era, agreed to call them, 'par excellence,' *the Gospels*.

### §. 2. Title of Mark's Gospel.

The Gospel ascribed to Mark was neither by himself, nor by the subsequent compilers of the New Testament canon, designated *the Gospel 'of' Mark*. The word *gospel* was not specifically employed,

in the time of the Evangelists, to denote *a particular kind of book* or *biography*. It had a more generic import. It meant *good news;* and just because it had that meaning, it was specially applied by Christians to *the best of all good news*, the news regarding Jesus Christ as the divine Saviour of sinners.

Hence the united compositions of the four evangelists were often, in the post-apostolic ages, called collectively *the Gospel*.[1] And each evangelical record in particular was *the gospel 'according to' the particular evangelist who compiled it.* The gospel in each case was *one*, —"the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God" (Mark i, 1); but it was that one gospel under the peculiar phase of a particular biographical presentation.

Hence the phrase "*according to.*" It is not, as some critics have contended, precisely equivalent to "*of*," for the gospel was not regarded as an emanation from the mind of the writer.[2] It was not the product, or *ποίημα*, of any human compiler or composer. It was obtained from a Higher Source. It was 'Inspired.' It must have been so, if it was a reality at all. But, as delivered by the evangelist, it assumed, in its form as distinguished from its essence, a peculiar phase in harmony with the size, shape, and symmetry of "the earthen vessel" in which it was 'handed out,' that it might be 'handed on.'

In the great majority of manuscripts, inclusive of the Alexandrine, the title of the Gospel is either substantially, or entirely, the same as in our common English version. In the Syriac Philoxenian version the word *holy* is introduced before the word *Gospel*, and the phrase *according to* is merged,—*the Holy Gospel of Mark.* In the Syriac Peshito version there was an attempt, though not remarkably felicitous, to do more justice to the idea suggested by the preposition,—*the Holy Gospel, the Announcement of Mark the Evangelist.*

It is noteworthy that in the two most venerable manuscripts extant, the Sinaitic (ℵ) and the Vatican (B), as also in F (the *codex Boreeli*), the title is fragmentary. It is just, *According to Mark;*—it being assumed, apparently, that the entire *fasciculus* of the compilations of the four evangelists was but one manifold Gospel.

---

[1] See, for instance, Tertullian *de Baptismo*, c. 15; and compare Irenæus, *adv. Hæreses*, iii, 11, and Origen's *Comment. in Joannem*, vol. iv, p. 98, ed. Delarue (*καὶ τὸ ἀληθῶς διὰ τεσσάρων ἔν ἐστιν εὐαγγέλιον*). See also Griesbach's *Commentarius Criticus*, Particula ii, p. 202.

[2] See *Introduction to the Gospel according to Matthew*, § 4.

## §. 3. The Name "Mark."

Marcus or Mark was a Latin name, and became a common Latin *prænomen*, as, for instance, 'Marcus' Tullius Cicero. The diminutive Marcellus was a surname of the Claudian family. A distinguished member of that family, Marcus Claudius Marcellus, defeated Hannibal at Nola. Cicero has an oration *pro* Marco Marcello.

The word "marcus" originally meant *a mallet;* and "marcellus" *a little mallet.* It is an old Indo-European word, that has left its *mark* on an extensive group of terms.[1] Our English *mark*, or the Anglo-Saxon *mearc*, is just that which was *marked* by the Latin *marc*. Hence too the Hamburg *mark*,—a silver coin of about 1s. 4d. in value. It was a piece of precious metal with a special *mark*. All coins indeed are particular *marks*. Hence also the market *mark*, as a specifically 'marked' weight, recognized in the 'markets' of many European nations. The word *march*, as meaning a *boundary*, or *limiting mark*, is but another form of the word. *Malleus* too is but another and softened form, and so consequently is our English *mall*, and the diminutive *mallet*.

The evangelist Mark, however, was, notwithstanding his Latin name, a Jew. His entire Gospel bewrays his nationality, and breathes the spirit of an Israelite, who, though delivered from Jewish narrowness and bigotry, was still "an Israelite indeed." In 'the letter' too, as well as 'the spirit' of his composition the *mark* of a Jewish mind is indelibly impressed.[2]

The reason why the evangelist either assumed, or got imposed on him, his Latin name, is now unknown. Probably he found it convenient, when out in the wide world, to wear a Gentile name. It might be even to himself, as well as to his friends, and all with whom he had to do, a significant badge, indicating that he was now a Christian cosmopolite.

Perhaps it was for a similar reason that Saul of Tarsus, after he

---

[1] See Fick's *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der Indogermanischen Sprachen*, p. 149. Though Fick did not remember *marcus*, when treating of the Indo-European *mark*, yet his collections, in so far as they are pertinent, are verified and unified by means of the word which he forgot.

[2] See, for instance, the construction in chapters i, 7; vii, 25.

got rid of the spiritual fetters which the Palestinian Jews were perpetually imposing on him, and had got fairly 'under weigh' in the career of his Gentile apostolate, called himself PAUL,—a word significant in Latin, and honourable in the estimation of all who could enumerate the most illustrious of the Roman families.

MARCUS or MARK may have been at first a mere surname added to the original Jewish name of the evangelist; and then by and by it may, from casual or conventional circumstances, have acquired such a peculiar emphasis as at length to supersede and finally extinguish its Hebrew forerunner. (See next Section.)

## §. 4. WAS MARK, THE EVANGELIST, THE JOHN MARK OF *THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES?*

Grotius[1] was of opinion that the Evangelist was *not* "John, whose surname was Mark," the son of that Mary of Jerusalem, to whose house Peter betook himself, on the night when he was so marvellously liberated from prison. (Acts xii, 12.) The distinguished critic was "moved," he says, to this opinion, partly by the fact that "the ancients" never call our Evangelist JOHN, and partly by the fact that they never speak of him as the travelling companion of Barnabas and Paul, but, invariably, as the attendant and interpreter of Peter. Calov in Germany, though always differing, as much as he could, from the great Dutchman, agreed with him in this opinion;[2] as did Cave[3] in England, and Cotelerius[4] (or Cotelier) in France,—and some other able men, such as a-Lapide and Tillemont. Petter[5] hesitated a little, but on the whole swung in the opposite direction. In more modern times the same opinion has been occasionally revived, as by Schleusner in his Lexicon, Kienlen in the *Studien und Kritiken* for 1843, Da Costa in his *Lectures on the Gospels* (1856), and Patrizi in his great work *De Evangeliis* (1853).[6]

---

[1] *Proœmium in Marcum.*

[2] *Biblia Illustrata,* in loc.

[3] *Scriptorum Ecc. Historia Literaria,* vol. i, 24.

[4] *Constitutiones Apostolorum,* ii, 57, note 36.

[5] The author of the *largest* Commentary on Mark, in two volumes folio, 1661.

[6] Lib. i, cap. ii, Quæstio 1. See also the 1st Appendix to his *Commentarium in Marcum.*

But there is no good reason for calling in question the unanimous tradition of "the ancients," that Mark the Evangelist was "John whose surname was Mark."

De Wette unites the voices of all the Christian ages, when he says, "The Mark to whom ecclesiastical tradition ascribes the second Gospel is undoubtedly John, or John Mark, of *the Acts of the Apostles*."[1] Dr. Davidson, though not believing that the second Gospel was really the composition of Mark, says, "It is probable that the Mark, to whom the second Gospel is commonly assigned, is the same who is called John (Acts xiii, 5, 13) and John Mark (Acts xii, 12, 25; xv, 37)."[2]

True, "the ancients," of whom Grotius speaks, uniformly call him MARK, not JOHN. But naturally so, for there were many conspicuous Johns in the early Christian circles, and in particular John the fourth Evangelist. In the New Testament writings themselves the tendency of the surname to displace the original Hebrew name is noteworthy. In Acts xii, 12, the first passage in which the bearer of the names is expressly referred to, he is called "John, whose surname was Mark;" and, in the 25th verse, this double appellation is repeated. In the succeeding chapter, verses 5th and 13th, he is referred to under his original Hebrew name exclusively,—JOHN. Then in chapter xv, 37, he is once more called "John, whose surname was Mark." But in the 39th verse of the same chapter he is called simply MARK. And this is the only name that is given him in the remaining passages of the New Testament,—Colossians iv, 10; 2 Timothy iv, 11; Philemon 24; and 1 Peter v, 13. The remark of Jerome on the third of these passages is equally applicable to the rest,—"I think that the Mark here mentioned is the author of the Gospel."[3]

As to the fact that "the ancients," when referring to Mark as the writer of the second Gospel, signalize exclusively his ministerial relation to Peter, as distinguished from his corresponding relation to Barnabas and Paul, nothing was more natural.

True, indeed, he was for a season the companion of Barnabas and Paul. See Acts xii, 25; xiii, 5. But for some reason or other he got wearied of that relationship, or of the work which it entailed, and

---

[1] *Lehrbuch des N. T.* § 99.

[2] *Introduction to N. T.*, vol. ii, p. 76, ed. 1868.

[3] "Marcum ponit, quem puto Evangelii conditorem." *Comment. in Philemonem, in loc.*—"Es ist höchst wahrscheinlich," says Michaelis, "dass Marcus der Evangelist, der Sohn Petri, und der Gefährte Pauli, eine Person gewesen ist." *Einleitung in N. B.*, p. 1051. 4th ed.

returned to his mother's house. (Acts xiii, 13.) Some of "the ancients" use strong language in reference to this retreat, and ascribe to him a kind of spiritual "poltroonery."[1] It is true, too, that when Barnabas and Paul were subsequently arranging for another joint tour, Mark was ready to join them, but Paul objected, while Barnabas insisted, "and the contention was so sharp between them that they departed asunder one from the other; and so Barnabas took Mark, and sailed unto Cyprus, and Paul chose Silas and departed." (Acts xv, 36—40.) As was to be expected, however, of good men and true, this coolness *(frigusculum)*—as Grotius calls it—at once between Paul and Barnabas, and between Paul and Mark, got dissipated, so that Mark was restored to intimate and confidential relations to the Apostle. In the Epistle to Philemon (v. 24) the Apostle names MARCUS as one of his "fellow-labourers." In Col. iv, 10, he says, "Marcus, sister's son (*ἀνεψιός cousin*) to Barnabas,—touching whom ye received commandments; if he come unto you, receive him,—saluteth you." And then in 2 Tim. iv, 11, the Apostle says again, when now near the very close of his terrestrial career, "Take Mark, and bring him with thee, for he is profitable to me for the ministry."

Still, as neither Paul nor Barnabas was able to supply, at first hand, the full historic details that were essential to a biographical Gospel, it is not to be wondered at, that Mark, having either a purpose, or an instinct, leading him in the direction of an Evangelist, should attach himself to Peter, and derive from him the information which he has embodied in his Gospel. And it is still less to be wondered at that "the ancients" who spoke of him, and felt interested in him, solely on account of his Gospel, should bring exclusively into view, so far as his authorship was concerned, his ministerial relation to Peter.

It is certain, moreover, that Peter was, from a very early period, in terms of the greatest intimacy with Mark and his mother. See Acts xii, 11—17. Not unlikely it might be by his preaching, on the day of Pentecost, or subsequently, that both the lady and her son became acquainted with the true career and character of the Saviour. And it is probably for this reason that we are to account for the peculiarly endearing manner in which Peter refers to the evangelist, at

---

[1] Hence the remarkable expression of Hippolytus, in the recently recovered *Philosophumena*, vii, 18, *Μάρκος ὁ κολοβοδάκτυλος*. See also the Prologue in the Codex Amiatinus,—"*amputasse* sibi post fidem *pollicem* dicitur." Consult Tregelles's *Canon Muratorianus*, p. 75.

the conclusion of his 1st Epistle,—"The church that is at Babylon, elected together with you, saluteth you; *and so doth Marcus my son.*" There is no reason for doubting that it is *our* Mark, and *Paul's* Mark, who is thus so affectionately mentioned. But there is less than none for imagining, with Heumann[1] and Credner,[2] or half-imagining, with Pott,[3] that he was Peter's *literal son.*

## §. 5. Covert reference to the Evangelist in the body of the Gospel.

It is probable that the evangelist makes a covert reference to himself in the body of his Gospel.

His whole narrative, indeed, like that of Matthew, is remarkably impersonal. Both the writers retire behind their themes, and shut themselves out of view. They are so absorbed, objectively, in their narrations, that they become 'subjectively' oblivious of themselves.

Nevertheless it is, in the highest degree, probable that Matthew refers to himself by name in the 9th verse of the 11th chapter of his Gospel, and to his home in the 10th verse. It is almost certain, too, that John refers to himself, as one of the two disciples spoken of, in the 1st chapter of his Gospel, verses 35—38. It is certain that it is of himself that he speaks, in chapters xiii. 23, xix, 26, as "the disciple whom Jesus loved."

We believe that it is, in like manner, to himself that Mark refers, when, in chapter xiv, 51, 52, he makes mention of "a young man," who had been aroused out of bed by the uproar connected with the conveyance of Jesus from Gethsemane to the residence of the High Priest. Full of youthful impetuosity, he had rushed, it seems, out of the house with only "a linen sheet thrown around him," to see what the disturbance was about. The incident was so trifling, intrinsically, that we can scarcely conceive of it being recorded by the evangelist, unless he had some private reason for its insertion. But if it touched the vital turning-point of his spiritual career, we can at once understand why he should delight to link it on, and thus, in a modest

---

[1] *Nöthiger Anhang zur Erklärung Marci*, pp. 736, 737. He rejoices over the imagination, as over a brilliant discovery.

[2] *Einleitung in das N. T.* §§ 48, 237.

[3] *Annotationes in* 1 Pet. v, 13.

and covert way, to attach his own personal and spiritual history, to the great events he was recording. It is worthy of being noted, in addition, that it is not likely that he should have learned the unimportant incident from either Peter or any other of the apostles, for, in the immediately preceding verse, he states that "they had all forsaken" the Lord "and fled."[1]

## §. 6. The Relation of the Apostle Peter to the Gospel: Patristic Evidence.

It was the almost unanimous conviction of "the Fathers," that Peter's oral discourses were the special source, or well-spring, from which Mark drew the information which is communicated in his Gospel.

Not that we need to suppose that he learned nothing from others. He would have ample opportunities in his mother's house, and elsewhere, for getting information from the other apostles, and their coadjutors, companions, and acquaintances. The little paragraph, too, regarding himself (§ 5), would of course be contributed directly by himself to himself. But still it was the current report and belief of Antiquity that he drew upon Peter in particular for the great body of the facts which he records.

(1.) Jerome, who flourished toward the close of the 4th century and the beginning of the 5th, says, in his *Catalogue of Illustrious Men*,—"Mark, disciple and interpreter of Peter, wrote a brief Gospel, "at the request of the brethren in Rome, *in accordance with what he "had heard related by Peter*. This Gospel, when read over to Peter, "was approved of, and published by his authority, to be read by the

[1] See *Commentary* in loc.—"Why was a circumstance apparently so trifling," asks Greswell, "and certainly so irrelevant, inserted in the midst of so grave "an account? If the young man was the writer of the account, and an eye-"witness of the transaction at the time; partly implicated himself in the "danger of our Saviour; mistaken for a follower or disciple, when not really "such; afterwards converted to the faith; and finally St. Mark the evangelist; "I think he might naturally look upon this as the most interesting circum-"stance of his life; and its introduction into the rest of the account, under "such circumstances, becomes anything but foreign or irrelevant."—*Dissertations on the Harmony of the Gospels*, vol. I, p. 100, ed. 1837.

"churches."[1] Putting no stress upon minutiæ of details in this statement, and bearing in mind that a fact, when got hold of, was liable, in the course of manipulation and transmission, to be unduly stretched and inconsiderately applied; still, it is evident that Jerome had got handed down, from the "fathers" who preceded him, that Mark was indebted, for the contents of his Gospel, to the communications of Peter.

In his Letter to Hedibia he tersely represents Peter as the *narrator*, and Mark as the *writer* of the Gospel.[2]

(2.) Stepping back from Jerome, we come to Epiphanius, who flourished just a little earlier. He says:—"But immediately after "Matthew, Mark, *having become an attendant of the holy Peter in "Rome, had committed to him the task of setting forth the Gospel.* "Having completed his work he was sent by the holy Peter into the "country of the Egyptians."[3] The dependence of the evangelist on the apostle is the substrate, and indeed the sum and substance, of this statement.

(3.) Eusebius preceded Epiphanius, and flourished toward the close of the 3rd century, and the beginning of the 4th. He says, in his *Evangelical Demonstration*, that though the Apostle Peter "did not "undertake, in consequence of excess of diffidence,[4] to write a Gospel, "yet it had all along been currently reported that Mark, who had "become his familiar acquaintance and attendant, made memoirs of "his discourses concerning the doings of Jesus."[5] The distinguished 'father' then proceeds, after some other details, to take notice of the fact that there is in Mark's Gospel a minute and particular account of Peter's lamentable denial of his Lord. After which account, he adds:—"It is Mark, indeed, who writes these things. *But it is Peter who*

---

[1] "Marcus, discipulus et interpres Petri, juxta quod Petrum referentem "audierat, rogatus Romæ a fratribus, breve scripsit Evangelium. Quod cum "Petrus audisset, probavit, et ecclesiis legendum sua authoritate edidit." *De Viris Illustribus, cap. viii.*

[2] "Marcum; cujus Evangelium, Petro narrante, et illo scribente, compositum est." *Cap. xi.*

[3] Εὐθὺς δὲ μετὰ τὸν Ματθαῖον ἀκόλουθος γενόμενος ὁ Μάρκος τῷ ἁγίῳ Πέτρῳ ἐν Ῥώμῃ, ἐπιτρέπεται τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐκθέσθαι. κ.τ.λ. *Hæresis*, 41, p. 428.

[4] δι' εὐλαβείας ὑπερβολήν.

[5] Τούτου Μάρκος γνώριμος καὶ φοιτητὴς γεγονὼς ἀπομνημονεῦσαι λέγεται τὰς τοῦ Πέτρου περὶ τῶν πράξεων τοῦ Ιησοῦ διαλέξεις. *Demonstratio Evangelica*, Lib. iii, c. 5, p. 120.

"*testifies them concerning himself; for all the contents of Mark's Gospel* "*are regarded as memoirs of Peter's discourses.*"[1] We need not press the remark regarding Peter's "excess of modesty." It was probably suggested to Eusebius by the representations of Clemens of Alexandria,[2] and may have been a subjective conjecture rather than a historical fact. But it is obvious that he got handed down to him, as a fact, that Mark, in the representations of his Gospel, is to a large extent but the echo of the narrations of Peter.

(4.) Origen flourished before Eusebius,—in the early part of the third century. In his *Commentary on the Gospel according to Matthew*, he mentions that there were four unchallenged and unchallengeable Gospels received throughout the universal church. "The "second of them," he says, "is that according to Mark, *who com-* "*posed it under the guidance of Peter*, who therefore, in his Catholic "Epistle, acknowledged the Evangelist as his son, saying, *The co-elect* "*in Babylon saluteth you, and Marcus my son.*"[3] We must not press the sequence that is intimated here in the inferential "*therefore.*" But the special relationship of the evangelist to the apostle is unequivocally and unwaveringly asserted.

(5.) Tertullian preceded Origen. He was born at Carthage about the year A.D. 160. Converted from heathenism when between thirty and forty years of age, his greatest literary activity was in the early part of the 3rd century. In his book *Against Marcion*, which was published in the year 207 or 208, he enumerates the four authoritative Gospels,[4] noting that we have two of them, namely those of John and Matthew, "from apostles,"[5] and other two, namely those of Luke and Mark, "from apostolicals."[6] He vindicates in particular the apostolical authority of the Gospel according to Luke, and then he

---

[1] Μάρκος μὲν ταῦτα γράφει· Πέτρος δὲ ταῦτα περὶ ἑαυτοῦ μαρτυρεῖ· πάντα γὰρ τὰ παρὰ Μάρκῳ τῶν Πέτρου διαλέξεων εἶναι λέγεται ἀπομνημονεύματα. *Id. p.* 121.

[2] See Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History, Lib. ii, c. 15, and Lib. vi, c. 14.*

[3] The original is preserved in Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History, Lib. vi, cap. 25*,—δεύτερον δὲ τὸ κατὰ Μάρκον, ὡς Πέτρος ὑφηγήσατο αὐτῷ, ποιήσαντα, κ.τ.λ. It is thence transferred by Delarue into his edition of *Origen's Works, vol. iii, p. 440.*

[4] Lib. iv, c. 2.

[5] "Ex apostolis."

[6] "Ex apostolicis."

adds, "the same authority of the apostolic *(or, in other words,* the "primitive) churches will likewise endorse the other Gospels which "have been handed down to us in their integrity from these "churches,—I mean those of John and Matthew; not excluding "that also which was published by Mark, for *it may be ascribed to* "*Peter, whose interpreter Mark was.*"[1]

(6.) Clemens of Alexandria, one of Tertullian's contemporaries, has also something to say of Mark, and his intimate connection, as an evangelist, with Peter. In a passage of his *Hypotyposes*, preserved in the invaluable *History* of Eusebius, he says:—"The occasion of writing "the Gospel according to Mark was as follows:—After Peter had "publicly preached the word in Rome, and declared the gospel by the "Spirit, *many who were present entreated Mark, as one who had for* "*long attended the apostle, and who knew by heart what he had said,* "*to reduce to writing what had been spoken to them.* Mark did so, "and presented to his petitioners his Gospel. When Peter became "cognizant of this, he neither laid an interdict on the undertaking, "nor urged its fulfilment."[2]

Eusebius makes, in an earlier part of his *History*, another reference to the representations of Clemens:—"So charmed were the Romans "with the light that shone in upon their minds from the discourses "of Peter, that, not contented with a single hearing, and the viva- "voce proclamation of the truth, *they urged, with the utmost solicita-* "*tion, on Mark, whose Gospel is in circulation, and who was Peter's* "*attendant, that he would leave them in writing a record of the* "*teaching which they had received by word of mouth.* They did not "give over till they had prevailed on him; and thus they became "the cause[3] of the composition of the so-called Gospel according "to Mark. It is said that when the apostle knew, by revelation of

---

[1] "Eadem auctoritas ecclesiarum apostolicarum cæteris quoque patrocina- "bitur evangeliis, quæ proinde per illas, et secundum illas, habemus,—Joannis "dico et Matthæi; licet et Marcus quod edidit, Petri affirmetur cujus interpres "Marcus."—*Adversus Marcionem*, lib. iv, c. 5.

[2] τοῦ Πέτρου δημοσίᾳ ἐν Ῥώμῃ κηρύξαντος τὸν λόγον, καὶ Πνεύματι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐξειπόντος, τοὺς παρόντας πολλοὺς ὄντας παρακαλέσαι τὸν Μάρκον, ὡς ἂν ἀκολουθήσαντα αὐτῷ πόρρωθεν καὶ μεμνημένον τῶν λεχθέντων, ἀναγράψαι τὰ εἰρημένα, ποιήσαντα δὲ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, μεταδοῦναι τοῖς δεομένοις αὐτοῦ. Ὅπερ ἐπιγνόντα τὸν Πέτρον, προτρεπτικῶς μήτε κωλῦσαι μήτε προτρέψασθαι. *Eccles. Hist. lib. vi, c. 14.*

[3] αἰτίους.

"the Spirit, what was done, he was pleased with the eagerness of the "men, and authorized the writing to be read by the churches."[1] There has been considerable discussion on the relation of the last statement in this quotation to the remark at the close of the preceding quotation.[2] De Wette[3] and Fritzsche[4] are positive that there is absolute contradiction. Credner[5] concedes that there is,—attributing it, however, to the reproductive representation of Eusebius. But de Valois thinks—apparently with reason—that the two statements are not irreconcilable;[6]—although he fails to lay his hand precisely on the principle of conciliation,—*the supposition of 'successive stages' in the case.* The Apostle's diffidence, or repugnance, in relation to the writing of a Gospel is assumed. He is not, therefore, at the outset of the enterprise, made acquainted with Mark's intention. By and by, nevertheless, he finds out what is going on; yet remains neutral, neither dissuading nor encouraging. At length, when the finished work is submitted to his inspection, it meets his approval, so that he sanctions it as a correct representation of the substance of his own statements. Such seems to be the view, entertained by Clemens, of the Apostle's relation to the Gospel. The dependence of the evangelist upon Peter for the substance of his narrations, is the central idea, and the only one, probably, to which we should attach historic weight.

(7.) We go back now to Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons in Gaul, but undoubtedly a native of the east. He flourished in the latter half of the second century; and was, as he tells us himself,[7] a young disciple of Polycarp, who was personally acquainted with the Apostle John. We are therefore now treading on the border-land of the apostolic age.

This celebrated 'father,' like Origen and Tertullian, makes particular reference to the four accredited evangelists. For, even in his day, it would appear, they stood apart from all competitors, on their own quadruple pedestal.

---

[1] *Eccles. Hist., Lib. ii, c. 15.*

[2] See Lardner's *Credibility of the Gospel History*, Part II, ch. xxii, pp. 212—218 of vol. II, ed. 1788.

[3] *Lehrbuch*, § 98, p. 172.

[4] *Prolegomena in Ev. Marci*, § 2.

[5] *Einleitung*, § 51, p. 113.

[6] Annotatio in *Euseb. Hist.*, vi, 14.

[7] See quotation from his Letter to Florinus in *Eusebius's Eccles. Hist.* v, 20.

In the beginning of the 3rd book of his *Treatise against Heresies*,[1] he mentions that *after the apostles were clothed with the power of the Holy Spirit, and fully furnished for the work of universal evangelization, they 'went out'* (exierunt) *to the ends of the earth, preaching the Gospel. Matthew went eastward to those of Hebrew descent, and preached to them in their own tongue, in which language he also published a writing of the Gospel;*[2] *while Peter and Paul went westward, and preached, and founded the church, in Rome.* "But," adds he, "after "the departure of these, *Mark the disciple and interpreter of Peter,* "*even he, delivered to us in writing the things which were preached by* "*Peter.*[3] And Luke, the attendant of Paul, set down in a book the "Gospel as preached by him."

It has been debated among critics, what can be meant by the expression, "*after the departure of these.*" Grabe would interpret it thus, *after the departure of Peter and Paul from Rome.*[4] Mill strongly advocated the same view.[5] C. Gottlob Hofmann contended for it too,[6] and Kuinöl.[7] Patrizi also leans toward it.[8] But such an interpretation seems to involve a somewhat aimless or insignificant specification.

If it had been possible to carry back the reference to the expression, "*they 'went out' to the ends of the earth,*" so as to suppose that Irenæus was informing us that it was after the "exodus" or final dispersion of the apostles, and thus at a late stage of the apostolic epoch, that Mark wrote his Gospel, several difficulties affecting the harmony of the various representations of 'the fathers' would be met.

But it is probable, nevertheless, that we may be shut up to accept the view of de Valois,[9]—endorsed, as it is, by the united judgements of Father Simon,[10] Michaelis,[11] Eichhorn,[12] Ber-

---

[1] Chapter 1, preserved in Rufinus's Latin Translation. The original Greek of the most important part of it is preserved in *Eusebius's Eccles. Hist.*, v, 8.

[2] *καί γραφὴν ἐξήνεγκεν εὐαγγελίου.*

[3] *μετὰ δὲ τὴν τούτων ἔξοδον, Μάρκος ὁ μαθητὴς καὶ ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου, καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρου κηρυσσόμενα ἐγγράφως ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε.*

[4] See his note in his edition of Irenæus, p. 199.

[5] *Prolegomena in Nov. Test.*, § 101.

[6] *Introductio in Nov. Test.*, c. xiii, p. 170.

[7] *Prolegomena in Marcum*, § 2.

[8] *De Evangeliis*, vol. i, pp. 37, 38.

[9] See his note in his *Eusebius*, p. 172, Migne's ed.

[10] *Historia Critica Textus N. T.*, i, c. 10.

[11] *Einleitung in den N. B.*, § 141, p. 1054, 4th ed.

[12] *Einleitung*, § 119, p. 607, 2nd ed.

tholdt,[1] Hug,[2] Credner,[3] Guericke,[4] Ebrard,[5] Klostermann,[6] Weiss,[7]—that the expression means, *after the 'decease' of these apostles.* Eichhorn ingeniously suggests that the word "departure" or "exodus" is used in allusion to what is said in 2 Pet. i, 15, "I will endeavour that you may be able, after my *decease* (literally, *departure*) to have these things always in remembrance."[8] If this interpretation be accepted, then we have, as regards the precise date of Mark's Gospel, and the consequent authentication of its contents by Peter, a representation which conflicts with that which we have found in Jerome, Epiphanius, Origen, and Clemens Alexandrinus. But it may be admitted, as we have already intimated, that, in minute details of things, 'the fathers' made free to vent their subjective subsumptions, assumptions, applications, and divinations, while yet the historic substance, or substrate, of the information handed down to them, and thence passed on, was a matter of indisputable validity.

We are not sure, however, that the real testimony of Irenæus has been conclusively ascertained. Christophorson, the author of an admirable Latin version of *Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History,* first published in 1570,[9] proposed to alter the text to the following effect, *after the publication of this,*[10] that is, *after the publication of Matthew's Hebrew Gospel,* as spoken of in the preceding sentence. Grotius accepted the alteration.[11] But de Valois expresses his astonishment at such an extraordinary emendation, "not knowing," as he says, on what ground Christophorson could venture to suggest it.[12] Yet it is a remarkable fact that in the "Hypothesis," or Prefatory Note to Victor of Antioch's *Commentary on the Gospel according to Mark* (sometimes ascribed to Cyril of Alexandria),[13] the same turn is given to Irenæus's observation. The entire quotation runs thus,—"*After the publication*

---

[1] *Einleitung,* § 335, p. 1281, 3rd ed.
[2] *Einleitung,* Zweiter Theil, § 16, p. 61, 4th ed.
[3] *Einleitung,* § 54, p. 118.
[4] *Gesammtgeschichte,* § 15, p. 139, 1st ed.
[5] *Wissenschaftliche Kritik,* § 133, p. 795, 2nd ed.
[6] *Markusevangelium,* p. 336.
[7] *Marcusevangelium,* p. 4.
[8] *Einleitung,* vol. i, pp. 607, 608.
[9] See Ittig's Preface to his *Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ Secundi Seculi Selecta Capita.*
[10] *μετὰ δὲ τούτου τὴν ἔκδοσιν.*
[11] *Prœmium in Marcum.*
[12] Note on *Eusebius's Eccles. Hist.,* v, 8.
[13] See first volume of *Cramer's Catena,* pp. 259—447.

"*of the Gospel according to Matthew*.[1] Mark, the disciple and interpreter "of Peter, even he, delivered to us in writing the things that were "preached by Peter." If this reading is no survival, or echo, of the original statement of Irenæus, it is at all events evidence that at a very early period some difficulty was found with the text as it now stands.

Whatever, however, may have been the exact expression or idea of Irenæus, he is indisputably at one with the fathers who succeeded him, in ascribing to Peter the *material*, out of which the Gospel according to Mark was compiled.

(8.) Going back from Irenæus, we come to Justin Martyr, who flourished in the first half of the second century. Though not making so frequent quotations from the Gospel of Mark, as he undoubtedly does—recent objections notwithstanding—from the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, yet he does sometimes quote from our Evangelist. And there is a remarkable passage in his *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*, in which he uses an incidental expression, of some significance and importance for our present purpose. He is referring, in his own ingeniously theorizing way, to the fact that our Lord imposed the name *Peter* upon the chief of the apostles, and the name *Boanerges* upon James and John. *The imposition of this latter name is recorded by Mark alone.* But Justin speaks of the matter in the following terms:—"And when it is said that he imposed on one of the apostles "the name Peter, *and when this is recorded in 'his Memoirs,' with* "*this other fact that he named the two sons of Zebedee Boanerges,* "*which means Sons-of-Thunder*, this is a sign that it was He by whom "Jacob was called Israel, and Auses, Jesus, (*i.e. Oshea, Joshua*)."[2]

Justin thus speaks of the record of Peter's change of name as being in "*his* Memoirs." In *whose* Memoirs? Lardner[3] and de Wette[4] say, *in Christ's*. Lang and Maranus, in their Latin versions, slur over a decision, translating "in the *apostolical* Memoirs." But Schwegler,[5] Norton,[6] and Smith of Jordanhill[7] legitimately contend that the

---

[1] μετὰ τὴν τοῦ κατὰ Ματθαῖον Εὐαγγελίου ἔκδοσιν.

[2] καὶ τὸ εἰπεῖν μετωνομακέναι αὐτὸν Πέτρον ἕνα τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ γεγράφθαι ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν αὐτοῦ γεγενημένον καὶ τοῦτο, μετὰ τοῦ. κ.τ.λ. § 106. Migne's ed.

[3] *Credibility of the Gospel History*, v. ii, ch. x, *Works*, vol. ii, p. 121, ed. 1788.

[4] *Lehrbuch des N. T.*, § 66.

[5] *Das nachapostolische Zeitalter*, vol. I, p. 221.

[6] *Genuineness of the Gospels*, vol. I, p. 131.

[7] *Dissertation on the Origin and Connection of the Gospels*, p. lxxii.

reference of the pronoun must be to Peter himself,—"in *Peter's* Memoirs." In many other passages Justin speaks of *the Memoirs of the Apostles*, meaning invariably *the Memoirs emanating from the Apostles*, that is to say, *the Gospels*,—which he thus recognized as all, directly or indirectly, of apostolic origin, and consequently of apostolic authority. With him the genitive connected with the word *Memoirs* is constantly the genitive of authorship, and not of the subject matter on which the authorship is exercised. In other words, he never speaks of *Christ's Memoirs*, but always of *the Apostles' Memoirs* (concerning Christ).

Smith contends that Peter was literally the literary author of the Primitive Gospel, the New Testament 'Protevangel,'—the *Urevangelium* as it is called by the Germans. It was composed, he assumes, in Aramaic. Matthew and Luke derived from it—he supposes—by simple translation, a large proportion of their materials; while Mark translated it entire, only adding to his version some minutiæ, such as the title in the 1st verse of the 1st chapter, and the epilogue of twelve verses which forms the conclusion of the last chapter. It is, as Smith conceives, because of this translation, that Mark is so frequently called,—as by Jerome, Tertullian, Irenæus, and Papias,—*the interpreter*, that is, *the translator of Peter*.

It is an ingenious theory. But we cannot accept it, for this, were there no other reason,—that the Gospel, if really Peter's, could never have got to be universally ascribed to Mark. The great name of Peter would never have been eclipsed, and indeed annihilated, behind the name of Mark, if Mark did nothing more than merely translate the Apostle's Gospel into Greek.

The exceptional representation of Justin is no evidence to the contrary. Neither is the somewhat analogous representation of Jerome, in the first chapter of his *Catalogue of Illustrious Men*, in which he says of Peter, "But the Gospel according to Mark, who was his disciple and interpreter, is also spoken of as his."[1] These statements are obviously to be explained as free and easy applications of the principle, that *the cause of the cause is the cause of the caused*. Peter's relation to the Gospel was something like that of a literary grandfather.

Hilgenfeld's theory is, up to a certain point, in accordance with Smith's. He supposes that Justin had no knowledge of our Canonical

[1] "Sed et Evangelium juxta Marcum, qui auditor ejus et interpres fuit, hujus dicitur."

Mark, but quoted from a real *Gospel of Peter*, which was, says he, "if you will, the Original Mark," only "richer." The Canonical Mark, as he conceives, was but an epitome or abstract (*Auszug*).[1] But is it not 'passing strange' that the entire Christian community should so prefer the impoverished epitome, that they allowed it,—without a single word of remonstrance, or of murmur, or even of remark, on the part of any of the churches, or any of the disputatious fathers,—not merely to supersede the "rich" apostolic Original, but also to become its burial-place, and the everlasting Lethe of its existence? It looks like a "miracle" in the history of the church.

(9.) We go farther back still than to Justin Martyr. We go to Papias, who flourished in the earliest part of the second century. He was, says Irenæus,[2] the companion of Polycarp,[3] one of the disciples of John the Apostle. He was himself the disciple of another John,[4]—John the Presbyter,—who was "a disciple of the Lord."[5] From this veteran, and from such other seniors or patriarchs as he could meet with, he eagerly collected,—but not with much discrimination of judgement, it would appear,[6]—all the apostolic fragments of things, on which he could lay his hands,—"all that could be remembered, "in particular, of the sayings of Andrew, or Peter, or Philip, or "Thomas, or James, or John, or Matthew, or any other of the "Lord's disciples." He thus raked together, amid some important items of information, many tittles and trifles of tradition, which he afterward elaborated, and published in his *Interpretation of the Lord's Oracles*,—a work consisting of five books.[7] It has perished,—whether happily or unhappily, it might be difficult to determine, for its contents would no doubt be unequal. But Eusebius has preserved, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, what the worthy compiler recorded, from the lips of John the Presbyter, concerning the Evangelist Mark. It seems to have been one of the most important 'anecdotes' in the work:—

---

[1] *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Evangelien Justin's*, pp. 278, 279. See also his *Markus-Evangelium*, pp. 93—117.

[2] See *Eusebius's Eccles. Hist.*, iii, 39.

[3] Πολυκάρπου ἑταῖρος.

[4] Ἰωάννου ἀκουστής.

[5] Klostermann, after Zahn and Riggenbach, supposes that John the Presbyter is just John the Apostle (*Markusevangelium*, p. 326). Unlikely.

[6] *σφόδρα γάρ τοι σμικρὸς ὢν τὸν νοῦν.* Eusebius, *loc. cit.*

[7] Eusebius, *loc. cit.*

"The Presbyter said this,—Mark, *having become the interpreter of* "*Peter*, wrote accurately whatever he[1] recorded.[2] He did not present, "however, in regular order the things that were either spoken or done "by Christ. For he had not been a personal auditor or follower of "the Lord. But afterwards, as I said, he attached himself to Peter, "who gave instructions according to the necessities of his hearers, "but not in the way of making an orderly arrangement of the Lord's "words. So that Mark committed no error in thus writing such details "of things as he recorded. For he made conscience of one thing, not "to omit on the one hand, and not to misrepresent on the other, any "of the details which he heard."[3] These things, says Eusebius, are left on record by Papias concerning Mark.

They embody,—notwithstanding the medium through which they were handed down to the historian and posterity,—the most important ecclesiastical information in reference to the evangelist, that has come to us from post-apostolic antiquity.[4] They embrace almost all that is reliable in the testimonies of the succeeding 'fathers.' And, as there is nothing intrinsically improbable in the record, there seems to be no valid reason why we should discard or ignore its testimony. Everything in it, on the contrary, is in harmony with the most trustworthy of the results that are attainable by inward examination of the texture of the Gospel, and its peculiar relation, as regards matter, method, and phraseology, to the two other Synoptics.

It will be noticed that Mark is called *the interpreter of Peter*. It is the first instance, on record, of the use of that expression. And it is to be attributed, we presume, not so much to Papias himself, as to his informant, John, who, we may conclude, found it circulating among the compeers and immediate successors of the Evangelist.

---

[1] That is, Mark; not Peter, as Mr. Badinel contends (*English Review*, xiii, p. 276).

[2] So should ἐμνημόνευσε be rendered, according to the favourite usage of Eusebius. Cruse renders it thus; and Dunster, and Badinel. *Remembered* is the translation of de Valois, Lardner, Michaelis, Routh, Thiersch, Meyer, Klostermann, Weiss.

[3] καὶ τοῦτο ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἔλεγε· Μάρκος μὲν ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου γενόμενος, ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν, ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν, οὐ μέντοι τάξει τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα· οὔτε γὰρ ἤκουσε τοῦ κυρίου, οὔτε παρηκολούθησεν αὐτῷ, ὕστερον δὲ, ὡς ἔφην, Πέτρῳ, ὃς πρὸς τὰς χρείας ἐποιεῖτο τὰς διδασκαλίας, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὥσπερ σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λόγων· ὥστε οὐδὲν ἥμαρτε Μάρκος, οὕτως ἔνια γράψας ὡς ἀπεμνημόνευσεν. Ἑνὸς γὰρ ἐποιήσατο πρόνοιαν, τοῦ μηδὲν ὧν ἤκουσε παραλιπεῖν, ἢ ψεύσασθαί τι ἐν αὐτοῖς.—Eusebius, *Eccles. Hist. III*, 39.

[4] See Olshausen's *Echtheit der Evangelien*, p. 101.

What is the meaning of the designation? A much debated point. Eichhorn,[1] Bertholdt,[2] Kuinöl,[3] Neudecker,[4] and many others, assume that the Apostle felt himself unequal to the effort of using the Greek language freely, while engaged in preaching the Gospel. He would be accustomed, therefore, they suppose, to preach in Aramaic; and Mark would be employed by him, as his interpreter, or 'dragoman,'[5] to render his addresses into Greek. It is an unlikely supposition.

Bleek saw its unlikelihood; but, attaching the same radical meaning to the word, conjectured, —as Wilhelm Wilcke had done before him,[6]—that it would be when the apostle's hearers understood Latin alone, that he would need a dragoman.[7] That dragoman he presumes to have been Mark. Also an unlikely supposition.

Schenkel, attaching the same radical import to the word, combines the two preceding conjectures. He supposes that the apostle, although having considerable experience in speaking to foreigners, could not use fluently either the Greek or the Latin tongue, at least for lengthened discourse, and that he hence employed Mark, for both languages, as the translator of his addresses.[8] Likewise unlikely, as gathering up into itself the separate unlikelinesses of the two preceding conjectures.

Smith of Jordanhill, still attaching the same radical idea to the word, and supposing therefore that Mark was so called, simply because he was "the *Translator* of Peter," imagined, as we have remarked in a former page,[9] that he received the appellation because he translated into Greek the apostle's Aramaic Gospel.[10] An equally unlikely conjecture, built on the basis of a conjecture more unlikely still.

Jerome's idea was better, though not entirely satisfactory. He assumed that Peter, "like Paul," was not satisfied with his own proficiency in Greek, and hence took advantage, so far as his written com-

---

[1] *Einleitung*, § 117, p. 597.
[2] *Einleitung*, § 334, p. 1277.
[3] *Prolegomena*, § 2.
[4] *Lehrbuch*, § 30, p. 226.
[5] Eichhorn's word.
[6] *Tradition und Mythe*, p. 50.
[7] *Einleitung*, pp. 112, 113, ed. 1862.
[8] *Das Charakterbild Jesu*, p. 332.
[9] See page xxviii.
[10] *Dissertation*, p. lxxiii.

munications were concerned, of the superior acquirements of a qualified *amanuensis*. "Paul therefore," he tells us, "employed Titus as an "*interpreter;* just as the blessed Peter employed Mark, whose Gospel "was composed by the latter out of the narrations of the former. "And the two epistles also," he continues, "which are ascribed to "Peter, differ from one another in style and character, and verbal "structure; from which fact it is evident that he had been con- "strained to make use of different *interpreters*."[1] Jerome thus understood by the word "interpreter," *an amanuensis who expressed in his own and improved phraseology the ideas that were dictated to him.*

Meyer approves of Jerome's views, and suggests the word *secretary* as an approximative synonym for the term employed by the 'fathers.'[2] Dean Alford adopts the suggestion.[3] Holtzmann too,[4] and Dr. Davidson.[5] But there is really not a particle of evidence in all antiquity, in or out of the Bible, that Mark was a greater master of Greek than Peter. If one might form an estimate from a comparative examination of the writings of the two authors, Mark was by no means more versant than Peter in "the wisdom" of any kind of "words." Peter's connection, moreover, at once by birth and by residence, with such a Gentilised region as Galilee, and his free intercourse with such Gentile individuals as Cornelius, constitute a sufficient guarantee that he would possess, for all practical purposes, a sufficient 'working' acquaintance with the Greek language.

Dunster thinks that the expression means, *the editor in writing, or publisher to the world, of the oral discourses of Peter.*[6] But this conception of the case seems neither to be in harmony with the essential import of the term, nor with the ideas that were prevalent among 'the fathers' regarding the work of our evangelist.

---

[1] "Habebat ergo Titum interpretem: sicut et beatus Petrus Marcum, cujus "Evangelium, *Petro narrante, et illo scribente,* compositum est. Denique et "duæ Epistolae quae feruntur Petri, stylo inter se et charactere discrepant, "structuraque verborum." Note *narrante,* not *dictante.—Epist. cxx, c. x, (ad Hedibiam).*

[2] *Einleitung,* § 1.

[3] *Prolegomena,* ch. iii, § 1.

[4] *Die Synoptischen Evangelien,* p. 367.

[5] *Introduction,* vol. ii, p. 79.

[6] He refers to Milton's use of the word in reference to Uriel, in *Par. Lost,* iii, 657. See his able *Discursory Considerations on the Supposed Evidence of the Early Fathers that Matthew's Gospel was first written,* pp. 77, 78.

Michaelis strikes the right vein:—"When Mark is called Peter's "*Interpreter* or *Hermeneut*, we must not think of a Translator. "Peter had no need of such a helper; and in truth he writes Greek "much better than Mark. But we should understand the word in a "sense analogous to what it bears, when applied to Mercury, *the "interpreter of the gods*, the messenger, that is to say, who communi- "cated to mortals what the gods had commissioned him to communi- "cate. So Mark was, as it were, the message-bearer of Peter, *an "under teacher, who taught others what he had heard from Peter, or "what had been intrusted to him by Peter.*"[1]

This, we believe, comes very near the 'mark' regarding the rationale of the designation given to Mark. It was not so much, apparently, because of any general assistance rendered to the apostle in the discharge of the ordinary duties of the apostolate, as because of the specific relation of the contents of his Gospel to the mind of Peter, as their literary source, that Mark was called the apostle's *Interpreter* or *Hermeneut*. Unlike Matthew and John, he wrote at second hand. And while undoubtedly "moved"[2] by a Higher Power than that of the simple personality of Peter, he yet drew his secondary inspiration from "the chief of the apostles." The events which he narrated, and the discourses and divine remarks which he recorded, were communicated to him by Peter. *And thus, in the matter of his biographical account of the Saviour, he was Peter's Interpreter.* This, we may add, is the view that is taken of the expression by Fritzsche,[3] Thiersch,[4] and Klostermann.[5]

We may remark, ere we leave this testimony of Papias, that what the Presbyter says regarding the absence of a strict "order" in the contents of Mark's Gospel must not be stretched so tightly, and therefore so unreasonably, as it was—co-ordinately—by Schleiermacher[6] and

---

[1] "Er ist Bote Petri, ein Unterlehrer, der andere das lehret, was er von Petro gehört hat, oder ihm von Petro aufgetragen ist," and then he adds, in language strikingly illustrative of amphibology, "und so werde ich es übersetzen, nicht wie andere gethan haben, Dollmetscher." *Einleitung*, § 141, p. 1052.

[2] 2 Peter i, 21.

[3] "Res Petri, verba Marci." *Prolegomena*, § i, p. xxvi.

[4] *Versuch zur Herstellung des historischen Standpuncts für die Kritik der N. T. Schriften*, p. 181.

[5] *Das Markusevangelium*, p. 329.

[6] *Studien und Kritiken*, 1832, pp. 735—768.

Credner.[1] They drew from the expression the inference that the writing referred to by Papias could not be our present Canonical Gospel, which is at least as *well-ordered* throughout as the other Gospels, but must have been some pre-existent compilation of a less-developed, and more miscellaneous character. "Fragmentary" is Schleiermacher's word.[2] And changes have been eagerly rung on it, and, in particular, on the idea that underlies it, by a numerous array of critics, who have the misfortune to imagine that it is in the interest of truth, that they should find some lever or other that might enable them to shake the reliability of the Gospel-History. But John the Presbyter did not mean that there was no "order" in the composition of Mark. Not even did he mean that there was no observance of chronological order. The Gospel *is orderly:* and the events recorded are grouped on a basis of true chronology. But it is, nevertheless, of the highest moment that the modern critic should bear in mind the truth of the Presbyter's observation. *There was no attempt, on the part of the Evangelist, to introduce exact historic order into all the details of his narrative.* There was no attempt at a strictly scientific chronology. It would be doing the Evangelist the greatest injustice to endeavour to impose it on his narrations. He allowed himself—like Peter in his discourses to the catechumens—scope and latitude in grouping. His work was not meant to be annalistic, or historically complete. But all that it aimed at was realized to perfection. It was meant to be *the gospel* in a biographical form; and it is therefore *a Gospel.* Like the other Gospels, it is the announcement, and unpretending presentation, of some of the salient doings and sayings of Him, who, in his own living presence in our nature, in our world, and in the world of glory, is Himself the Everlasting Gospel of the Grace of God.

## §. 7. Relation of the Gospel to the Apostle Peter: Internal Evidence.

There is, certainly, nothing in the contents or texture of Mark's Gospel, which can decisively determine that it was drawn from the well-spring of Peter's discourses.

---

[1] *Einleitung*, § 57, pp. 123, 124.

[2] *Einleitung*, § 68, p. 250. See also § 67.

But, on the other hand, there is nothing that is, in the least degree, at variance with the patristic tradition.

Here and there, moreover, phenomena of representation occur, as also, in some cases, phenomena of omission, or things "conspicuous by their absence," which admit of felicitous explanation on the hypothesis of a peculiarly intimate relationship to Peter.

It is not to be doubted, indeed, that all the Synoptic Gospels bear, to a considerable degree, the impress of this Apostle's idiosyncrasy. He was the leader of the original Twelve. He was their chosen spokesman. He would be their chief speaker. The forms, consequently, in which he put his descriptions of his ocular and auricular observations, would naturally become models to the rest of the circle, or moulds, in which their public representations of what they themselves, as well as he, had seen and heard, would take definitive shape. His image would be unconsciously stamped on the whole currency of their ministrations.

Nevertheless, each of his brethren would, in his individual exhibitions of the facts, which constitute the biographical contents of the gospel, contribute something out of his own individuality. Hence there would be differences in setting, differences in grouping, differences in modes of expression, differences in the admission or omission of scenes or minuter details. In such an original mind, moreover, as that of John, there would be an amount of peculiarity that would entirely overlap, or perhaps completely supersede, the distinctive one-sidedness of Peter's presentations, or the parallel replacements, modifications, and additions of the rest of the apostles.

No wonder, therefore, that critics in general should have agreed to class the first three Canonical Gospels as "synoptic,"[1] setting John's apart on a pedestal by itself. No wonder, moreover, that a considerable school of investigators—of whom more hereafter—should have conceived that Mark must have borrowed from Matthew. No wonder that another considerable school should have imagined that he borrowed from both Matthew and Luke. And no wonder, in addition, that still another school should have contended, reversely, that it was on Mark that Matthew and Luke unitedly drew for the main body of their materials. Undoubtedly they did derive a large amount of the contents of their Gospels from the copious well-spring, from which Mark still more directly drew.

---

[1] They can, to a large extent, be exhibited in a *synopsis* of parallel columns. See, for instance, *Griesbach's Synopsis.*

When we assume, in accordance with the emphatic testimony of 'the fathers,' that Mark drew directly from the discoursings of Peter, then we understand how it comes to pass that it is in his pages, that we have the most particular account of that lamentable denial of his Lord, of which the apostle was guilty, (chap. xiv, 30, 31; 54; 66—72). On no other person's memory would the minute particulars of the prediction, and of its unanticipated fulfilment, be so indelibly engraven. It is also noteworthy that while the very severe rebuke, which our Lord administered to Peter, in the neighbourhood of Cæsarea-Philippi, is faithfully and circumstantially recorded in Mark's pages, (chap. viii, 33), the splendid eulogium and distinguishing blessing, which had been previously pronounced, are, as it were, modestly passed by. (See Matt. xvi, 17—19.) Doubtless the great apostle would not be guilty of making frequent or egotistic references to such marks of distinction. *It is likely*, says Eusebius, *that Peter maintained silence on these points; hence the silence of Mark.*[1]

Then, the very house, which he occupied in Capernaum, though in the other Synoptic Gospels simply called *Peter's* or *Simon's*, is in Mark's called "the house of Simon *and Andrew*" (i, 29). It is as if Mark were reproducing the statement that would naturally drop from the lips of the apostle,—"the house that was occupied *by my brother and me.*" Then again, when, in the account of the Transfiguration, we read of Peter's proposal to erect three tabernacles, it is naively added, "for he wist not what to say" (ix, 6). One almost hears the Apostle rehearsing the whole matter; and, when coming to the project of erecting the tabernacles, he would pause and add something to the following effect,—"*I thought I should say something: but really I did not know what to say; I was so confounded and overwhelmed with awe. In the end I actually said something foolish.*" This latter part of his account is reproduced in Luke's narrative (ix, 33). The way too, which the angel, who appeared to the women in the empty sepulchre, makes reference to the faithless apostle strikes us as peculiarly touching, if it be regarded as reproduced by the Evangelist from the lips of the apostle himself,—"Tell his disciples *and Peter*,—He goeth before you into Galilee" (xvi, 7). The apostle would delight to give emphasis to the semi-redundant clause, involving, as it did, the forgiving mercy of the Master he had so shamefully mistrusted and denied.

There are, besides, throughout the entire Gospel, multitudes of

[1] *Demonstratio Evangelica*, iii, 5, p. 121.

minute graphic touches, which bewray the evangelist's connection with some peculiarly observant eye-and-ear-witness, such as Peter no doubt would be. For instance, the personal looks and gestures of our Lord are more frequently specified than in either of the other Synoptic Gospels. (See chapters i, 31; iii, 5, 34; v, 32; vii, 33, 34; viii, 12, 33; x, 27.) Then there are such vivid circumstantialities as the "pillow" in the boat (iv, 38),—the "green grass" at passover-time on the hill side (vi, 39),—the "roundabout road" from Bethany to Bethphage (xi, 4),—the colt tied "outside," not *inside*, the quadrangle of the owner's house (xi, 4),—and the "one loaf" which the flustered disciples had with them on the sea (viii, 14). These are singularly luminous points.

The two other Synoptic Evangelists record, as well as Mark, *the little children scene*. But Mark alone makes mention of the interesting circumstance that our Lord, in blessing the little ones, "folded them in his arms" (x, 16). He alone, too, mentions that, on another occasion, the same gentle "embrace" was given to the little child, who was set in the midst of the disciples, as the model of an unambitious spirit (ix, 36). Something of the same motherly tenderness of spirit was displayed in our Lord's treatment of the little girl of twelve years of age, whom he restored to life. Not only did he "take her by the hand" in the act of reviving her, as both Matthew and Luke, as well as Mark, record; he spoke to her, as we learn from Mark alone, in her own familiar mother-tongue, *Talitha cumi* (v, 41). Peter was present (v, 37), and would hear.

The circumstantialities connected with the case of the woman, who came behind and touched the hem of the Saviour's garment, have, all along, in Christian circles, excited the special interest of the pious. They are given by Mark more graphically, and in fuller detail, than by the other Evangelists (v, 24—34). And so, to a noteworthy extent, is the history of the cure of the demoniac lad at the base of the Mount of Transfiguration. The whole scene is drawn to the life; but when we come to that notable home-thrust so felicitously dealt by our Lord, and with such readiness, by which he turned back, on the stupified father, "the *If it be possible to thee*," we cannot doubt that we are listening to the report of one, who had been just such a keen and tenacious observer as we picture Peter to have been. (See ix, 23, and *Commentary* in loc.)

There are other vivid circumstantialities, agreeing well with the idea that Peter was drawn upon :—for instance, the taunt which the Nazarenes threw at our Lord, "the carpenter" (vi, 3);—the name of

the blind beggar at Jericho, evidently 'a character,'—"Bartimæus (x, 46);—the earnest bilingual address, "Abba-Father," in the Lord's agony-prayer in Gethsemane (xiv, 36);—and that little insignificant, yet most significant, particular in *the cornfield scene*, unhappily slurred over both by Luther and in our English version, but incontestably bewraying the autopticity of the narrator,—"they began to make a way" (ii, 23, and see *Commentary*). It is enough. We would only specify, in conclusion, one other incidental circumstantiality. When Peter got a place at the fire, in the court of the High Priest's house, he had, we are told, in Mark's narrative, his face, unfortunately, or fortunately, "*to* the light," so that his features stood out in full relief (xiv, 54). Who so likely to remember the fact, and to give it emphasis, as Peter himself?

In short, if we assume the patristic tradition regarding the apostle's relation to Mark, we find the contents and texture of the Gospel to be,—without a jar at any point,—in perfect accord with the idea.

## §. 8. The Genetic Relation of the Gospel to the Synoptic Gospels of Matthew and Luke.

The oldest ecclesiastical writers say nothing regarding the genetic relation of our Gospel to the other two Synoptic Gospels. But Augustin speculated on the subject. Assuming the chronological anteriority of Matthew's Gospel, he imagined that Mark followed in his steps, *like a footman*,—only taking shorter cuts, or abbreviating the evangelical narrative as he went along.[1] "He has," says Augustin, "nothing in his Gospel which he shares with John alone. "He has very little that is peculiar to himself. He has still less in "common with Luke alone. But he has very much in common with "Matthew, often expressed too in just so many, and indeed the very "same, words. In these instances he sometimes accords with Matthew "alone, and sometimes with the other Gospels in addition, when they "run parallel with Matthew."[2]

[1] "Marcus eum subsecutus, tanquam pedissequus et breviator ejus videtur."—*Consensus Evangelistarum*, I, 2.

[2] "Cum solo quippe Joanne, nihil dixit; solus ipse, perpauca; cum solo "Luca, pauciora; cum Matthæo vero, plurima, et multa pene totidem atque "ipsis verbis, sive cum solo, sive cum cæteris consonante."—*Consensus Evv.* ut supra.

Augustin had somewhat minutely observed the remarkable correspondences and variations of the Four Gospels, though he speculated no further regarding their genetic inter-relationship. It is a fact that there are no correspondences that are peculiar to Mark and John. It is also a fact that there are but few incidents in the life of our Lord, and but few of his discourses or remarks that are recorded by Mark alone. It is likewise a fact that there is still less that is peculiar to Mark and Luke as a pair. Eichhorn,[1] followed by Bertholdt,[2] specifies only five paragraphs of this description, four of which are very brief. The five are these, (1.) Mark i, 21—28, Luke iv, 31—37; (2.) Mark i, 35—39, Luke iv, 42—44; (3.) Mark iii, 7—19, Luke vi, 12—16; (4.) Mark iv, 21—29, Luke viii, 16—18; (5.) Mark xii, 41—44, Luke xxi, 1—4.

Eichhorn has made a mistake in specifying the third of these paragraphs, for it is almost as fully given in Matthew x, 1—4 as in Luke vi, 12—16. There is a mistake too in the fourth specification, for verses 21—25 of chapter iv have their homologues as really in Matthew (v, 15, x, 26, vii, 2, xxv, 29), as in Luke; and verses 26—29 have nothing in either Luke or Matthew that is analogous. So that only three peculiar paragraphs remain. Of these, it is merely the first, and longest, in which there is a verbal agreement. And that verbal agreement is complete only in two verses, namely the 24th and 25th of Mark, and the 34th and 35th of Luke. In these two verses, however, the phraseology is all but identical,—absolutely so in the received or Erasmian text.

Ferdinand C. Baur gives a list of the peculiar coincidences of Mark and Luke, somewhat different from Eichhorn's. He has Eichhorn's first, second, and fifth instances. But he has other three, viz. (1.) Mark iii, 7—12, Luke vi, 17—19; (2.) Mark ix, 38—40, Luke ix, 49—50; (3.) Mark xii, 38—40, Luke xx, 45—47.[3] Let them be accepted.—Augustin was right in saying that the precise correspondences that are found between Mark and Luke, without homologues in Matthew and John, are few,—fewer indeed than the peculiarities in incident or discourse that are found in Mark alone.

He is also correct in saying that the correspondences between Mark and Matthew are very numerous. If we take, for instance, such a work as Griesbach's *Synopsis of the three Synoptic Gospels*, we find

---

[1] *Einleitung*, vol. I, § 70, p. 348.

[2] *Einleitung*, vol. III, § 301, p. 1103.

[3] *Markusevangelium*, p. 114.

that, in a sum-total of a hundred and fifty Sections, into which he subdivides his *Synopsis*, there are between sixty and seventy, in which there are marked correspondences between Matthew and Mark. If, again, we take, let us say, Robinson's *Harmony of the Four Gospels*, we find that in the hundred and seventy-three Sections, into which he distributes the harmonised narrative, there are above eighty, in which the harmony of Mark and Matthew is regarded as evident.

Augustin, therefore, was correct in the general result of his collation.

But there are insuperable objections to his theory of the genetic relationship of Mark's Gospel to Matthew's. His great name, indeed, bore down, for many centuries, so far as the Western church was concerned, everything like opposition to his view: only, there were now and again put forth, tentatively, small tinkering efforts to reconcile Mark's 'footman'-relationship to Matthew with the 'interpreter'-relationship to Peter ascribed to him by the other fathers. Even after the revival of letters, and the subsequent genesis and development of a somewhat independent spirit of biblical criticism and theological inquiry, Augustin's opinion remained for long comparatively unchallenged. Le Fèvre d'Etaples, however, with his characteristic independence, strongly opposed it.[1] But Erasmus acquiesced in it.[2] And so did even Wetstein, in his day,—though he made some little allowance for the independent influence of Peter's instructions.[3]

It is, however, an utterly indefensible theory, and has been long abandoned by all critics, as a crudity of nascent speculation. It would account, indeed, for the minute verbal correspondences that sometimes occur in the two Gospels, as, for instance, in Matthew xxiv, 1—36; and Mark xiii, 5—32. But it can never account for the divergences of phraseology, which also frequently occur; and the divergences in order too. Still less can it afford a clue to a principle of omission, that would account for the absence of some of the most interesting contents of Matthew's narrative. And yet less still can it account for the multitudes of vivid touches in details, which are present in Mark, but wanting in Matthew, and which have all the appearance of 'autopticity;'—such for instance as the circumstantialities connected with the cure of the demoniac-lad at the foot

[1] *Commentarius in Marcum;* Procemium, fol. 216, ed. 1522.
[2] *Annotationes in Marcum;* Procemium, in all the editions.
[3] *Novum Testamentum;* Procemium in Marcum.

of the mount of transfiguration (chap. ix, 14—29). And then the theory not only fails, it entirely founders, when the fact is taken into account, that there are incidents, discourses, and remarks, found in Mark, of which there are no traces whatsoever in Matthew. See, for instance, the remarkable parable contained in chapter iv, 26—29; and the remarkable miracles recorded in chapters vii, 31—37, and viii, 22—26. See also the fact of the pairing of the apostles when sent out on their first apostolical tour (vi, 7). See likewise those great deep utterances in chapters iv, 22; iv, 28; ix, 23; ix, 40; ix, 49; and those remarkable expressions in chapters vii, 3, and xiv, 41:—all of which are peculiar to Mark.

When we take the sum-total of these details of things into consideration, we cannot hesitate to come to the conclusion that Koppe was right in the title of his Dissertation, published in 1782, *Mark not the Abbreviator of Matthew.*[1]

Neither did the Evangelist, as Griesbach imagined,[2] *cut and cull his narrative, in an alternating manner, out of the two Gospels of Matthew and Luke.* It is an extremely artificial and mechanical theory. And yet the distinguished critic actually supposed that he could reproduce the precise zig-zag process that was pursued by the Evangelist, as he elaborated his Gospel out of the two anterior Gospels lying before him.

Mark had resolved, according to Griesbach, to compile out of the two a shorter account than either, and to make it suitable for Gentile readers. That was his general determination.

He then started with Matthew, to whose leadership he intended to adhere in the main. He omitted however, at the outset, the whole contents of the first and second chapters, as having no immediate reference to the public ministry of Christ. Coming down, therefore, to the third chapter, he passed carefully along its course, and thence down to the 22nd verse of the fourth chapter,—appropriating the facts recorded in that stretch, and condensing the substance of the narrative into the first twenty verses of his own first chapter.

Then, looking forward to the fifth, sixth, and seventh chapters of

---

[1] *Marcus non Epitomator Matthæi,*—published in *Pott & Ruperti's Sylloge*, vol. I, pp. 35—69.

[2] *Commentatio qua Marci Evangelium totum e Matthæi et Lucæ commentariis decerptum esse monstratur.* See pp. 358—425 of his *Opuscula Academica*, vol. II.

Matthew, and noticing that they contained a long and 'verbose' discourse[1]—the Sermon on the Mount—which he wished, as Ferdinand C. Baur expresses it, "completely to ignore,"[2]—he turned to Luke. Following the thread of this Evangelist's narrative, he comes to chapter iv, 31, which seems to refer to the same period that is spoken of toward the close of that paragraph of Matthew, which he had already turned to account. He goes on, therefore, with Luke iv, 31—44, reproducing that paragraph into verses 21—39 of his own first chapter. Then he looks forward to Luke v, 1—11, which seems to him to be not unlike what he had already recorded in verses 16—20 out of Matthew iv, 18—22. He therefore pretermits that paragraph; but makes use of what follows from v, 12 to the end of the chapter, and thence on to vi, 11. All this he reproduces in his own Gospel, throughout chapters i, 40—45; ii, 1—28; iii, 1—6.

Then he thinks it time to go back to Matthew, where he finds in chapter xii, 14, a parallel statement to his own in chapter iii, 6. Hence, for some inexplicable reason, he spins out a paragraph consisting of verses 7—12 in his own third chapter, to correspond with verses 15 and 16 of Matthew xii. But noticing that what follows in Matthew is a quotation from the Old Testament, he feels as it were repelled,[3] and turns once more to Luke, taking up the narrative, where he had formerly left it, and transferring, in his own way, verses 12—16 of chapter vi, into verses 13—19 of his own chapter iii. Then he seems to have got wearied of Luke, and turns to Matthew once more, and makes use of xii, 22—32 in his own iii, 20—30.

He then passes over verses 33—45 in Matthew, as containing matter that he did not wish; but instead of turning abruptly on that account to Luke, as might have been expected, he reproduces in that portion of his own narrative, which extends from chapter iii, 31—35 to chapter iv, 1—20, what he found in Matthew xii, 46—50, and xiii, 1—23. Then he turns once more to Luke and makes use of viii, 16—18 in his own iv, 21—25. After which he reverts again to Matthew xiii, 24—30; but in place of reproducing the parable there contained, he is reminded by the expression "*while the men slept*," of another parable in which not the '*men*,' but *the husband-*'*man*,' *slept*, and so he inserts it instead, in iv, 26—29. Then, he copies from Matthew once more, reproducing Matthew's two verses,

---

[1] "Nimis enim verbosa videbatur ei."—p. 371.

[2] "Er die Bergrede völlig ignorirte."—*Markusevangelium*, p. 148.

[3] "Consulto omittit locum prophetæ comm. 17—21 laudatum."—p. 372.

xiii, 31, 32, into his own three, iv, 30, 31, 32. After that, passing over the little parable in the 33rd verse of Matthew, he condenses what he finds in the 34th and 35th verses, into his own statement as contained in his verses 33 and 34. And at length "fatigued" with the multitude of Matthew's parables, "he bids good-bye for a little" to his chosen leader,[1] and, betaking himself again to Luke, resumes the thread of narrative, which he had let go, when he turned to Matthew xiii, 24. He finds, however, on resuming the thread, that he had already obtained out of Matthew what corresponds to Luke viii, 19—21, and hence he passes on to the following paragraphs, in verses 22—25, and verses 26—56. These he reproduces in his own chapter iv, 35—41, and chapter v, 1—43. Then he once more relents, though still only half recovered from the inundation of parables,[2] and turns to Matthew xiii, 53—58: &c., &c., &c.

Enough! More, in truth, than enough!

As a theory of genetic relationship, this *pendulum hypothesis* is surely, to the last degree, unlikely. It almost suggests the idea of biblical burlesque or profane parody. Certainly, it entirely fails, in the first place, to give a sufficient reason for its hop-and-skip principle of transition from the one Gospel to the other. It entirely fails, in the second place, to account for those peculiarities of incident, discourse, and remark, which are found in Mark alone. Griesbach says that these occupy in all only about twenty-four verses.[3] But this is ridiculously unreal, when we add the copious circumstantialities, which besprinkle the Gospel throughout, to the sections which deal with scenes that have no parallels at all in either Matthew or Luke.[4] The theory, in the third place, entirely fails to account for those characteristic touches of description, which impart vivid-

---

[1] "Cum vero Matthæus porro parabolis adderet parabolas, Marcus velut "fatigatus hunc ducem aliquantisper valere jussit."—p. 374.

[2] "Marcum nimia parabolarum Matthæi cap. 13 copia quasi obrutum, "Lucæ se adjunxisse comitem vidimus. Verumtamen cum Matthæum "potissimum sibi elegisset, ad cujus ductum memorabilia Christi scripto "consignaret, jam ad Matthæum suum redit."—p. 375.

[3] "Marcus totum libellum suum, *si viginti et quatuor circiter commata*, "quæ de sua penu addidit, excipias, e Matthæi et Lucæ commentariis com-"pilavit."—p. 369, also p. 380.

[4] See the detailed evidence in Wilke's *Specimen Hermeneuticum de iis, quæ ab uno Marco sunt narrata, aut copiosius et explicatius ab eo, quam a cæteris Evangelistis, exposita.* There is a summary in pp. 188—192. See also August Knobel *de Evangelii Marci Origine*, pp. 29—56.

ness, by single flashes, to the scenes depicted, and suggest that the Evangelist must be drawing on the reports of some eye-witness, who had the tact of felicitously seizing, in what he saw and heard, points of irradiation, and salient items of detail. Then, fourthly, it entirely fails, in addition, to account for the thorough homogeneousness, all through the Gospel, of the Evangelist's style of composition,—simple, artless, and homely though that style confessedly is.[1] If he had been borrowing his *matériel*, alternately, from the writings of Matthew and Luke, one would have expected, as the unavoidable result of his double dependence, to find, in alternative sequence, a certain reflection, distinct or dim,—a '*nuancirung*' at least,—of the two different styles, to which the pendulum of his attention successively turned. But there is no such alternation of reflection or shade. And thus the theory again breaks down; as it also conspicuously does, when, in the fifth place, one attempts, in consistency with it, to account for the many minute diversities which, amid the multitudes of minute coincidences, mottle the representations of Mark, and stamp them with a phase that is entirely his own.

The theory is certainly untenable. But, as it is positive on the one hand, and completely removed from the region of mystical haze on the other; as it happily stirred the stagnant waters of criticism, and disturbed the old, shallow, self-arrogating hypothesis of Mark's exclusive dependence on Matthew; as it was wrought out, moreover, and propounded by an author, renowned for ability, learning, critical acumen, and independence of judgement;—it was—although amid much contention and opposition—extensively espoused. Saunier, in particular, elaborately defended it in a special Treatise on *The Sources of Mark's Gospel*.[2] Sieffert too defended it; though he tried to reconcile it with the testimony of Papias regarding the relationship of the Gospel to the teachings of the Apostle Peter.[3] Fritzsche also espoused it zealously, and made it the basis of his *Commentary on*

[1] "Of all the New Testament writers," says Michaelis, "none appear to "have given themselves less concern, than Mark, concerning elegance of "diction and purity of Greek." *(Unter allen Schriftstellern des N. T. scheint keiner um die Zierde der Rede, und um die Reinigkeit des Griechischen weniger bekümmert gewesen zu sein, als Marcus).*—Einleitung, § 147, p. 1076.

[2] *Ueber die Quellen des Evangeliums des Marcus (1825).*

[3] *Prolusio, qua diversæ recentiorum criticorum sententiæ de fontibus Evangelii St. Marci antiquissimæ traditionis ecclesiasticæ ope conciliantur (1829).* See also his subsequent *Abhandlung über den Ursprung des ersten kanonischen Evangeliums (1832)*, p. 178. The former work is little known even in Germany.

*Mark*,—a *Commentary* remarkable alike for scholarly ability, and for critical tyranny of tone. It was asserted, moreover, in the most positive manner imaginable by Evanson, in his *Dissonance of the Four generally received Evangelists*.[1] It is contended for by Dr. Davidson; only, he postulates, in addition, that the unknown Evangelist must have made use of "the primitive Mark, or Petrine Gospel, referred to by Papias."[2] Strauss, too, accepted it with eagerness as demonstrated.[3] He found it to be subservient to his own ulterior critical aim,—for it is obvious that there could be no place for the mythical theory of the *Gospel-History*, if Mark's *Gospel-Writing* rested directly on the authority of an actual eye-and-ear witness, such as Peter. Strauss, therefore, in his later work, persists in his adherence to the theory of Griesbach.[4] Gfrörer also, as might be expected from the kinship of his spirit to that of Strauss, accepts it, and "holds it for *an established fact*, that Mark not only "had the two other Synoptic Gospels lying open before him, *but* "*transcribed them*."[5]

The underlying principle of the theory, viz. that Mark made use of the Gospels of both Matthew and Luke, had been, at an earlier period, ably and reverently advocated by Dr. Henry Owen, in his *Observations on the Four Gospels (1764)*.[6] It was accepted as a "very probable" hypothesis by Harwood;[7] and it has been contended for, or maintained, by many critics since, inclusive of Neudecker,[8] de Wette,[9] and Bleek.[10] It is also maintained, under a certain developed

---

[1] He represents Mark's narrative as "compiled entirely of passages copied, often literally, either from the Gospel called Matthew's, or Luke's."—P. 212 of 1st ed. (1792), or p. 275 of 2nd ed. (1805).

[2] *Introduction*, vol. ii, pp. 90—103.

[3] 1st zur Evidenz erhoben.—*Leben Jesu*, vol. I, § 12, p. 65, ed. 1835.

[4] *Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk (1864)*, p. 86.

[5] "Markus die beiden Anderen nicht nur vor sich gehabt, sondern ausgeschrieben hat. Dass Letzteres wirklich der Fall sey, halte Ich wenigstens fur eine ausgemachte Thatsache."—*Geschichte des Urchristenthums*, *Band iv*, *Kap.* 9, p. 123.

[6] See, in particular, pp. 62—75.

[7] *Introduction to the Study and Knowledge of the New Testament*, vol. I, chap. iv, § 3, p. 135.

[8] *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung*, § 32, p. 232.

[9] *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung*, § 94.

[10] *Einleitung in das N. T*, p. 243. See also his *Beiträge zur Evangelien-Kritik*, pp. 72—75.

phase, by Ferdinand C. Baur,[1] Schwegler,[2] Köstlin,[3] and the other true adherents of "the Tübingen school."

De Wette gives effect to his opinion on the subject, by arranging his *Handbook-Exposition of the Gospels* thus, (1.) Matthew, (2.) Luke, (3.) Mark, (4.) John. Köstlin, in like manner, in his elaborate Treatise on the *Origin and Composition of the Synoptic Gospels*, divides his work into three Books or Sections, arranged thus,—(1.) *the Gospel according to Matthew*, (2.) *the Gospel according to Luke*, (3.) *the Gospel according to Mark*. Although he holds that there was an Original Mark, anterior to both Matthew and Luke, yet he maintains that the Canonical Mark was subsequent to these other Synoptics, and dug out of their materials.

In addition to the general notion that Mark made use of the Gospels of both Matthew and Luke, the critics of the Tübingen School,—such as F. C. Baur, Schwegler, Köstlin, already referred to,—attribute to the Evangelist a particular doctrinal aim, or "tendency" as they express it,—having a particular relation to the parties that were co-existing, at the time of the composition of the Gospel, within the circle of the churches. Matthew is regarded as having had an Old Testament "tendency," on the side of the Judaic party. Luke, in his "tendency," is regarded as having been anti-Judaic and Pauline. And Mark, coming after both, as is assumed, and mediating as it were between them, is looked upon as meeting a more matured condition of the divergent parties,[4] when their wisest leaders were wishful to shake hands and agree. His Gospel is therefore "neutral" and "irenic." It, as it were, *riddles out* of the other two whatever was calculated to set Christian in antagonism to Christian.[5] "It is the product," says Köstlin, "of the idea of Catholicity."[6]

It may, on all hands, be safely admitted, that there is a certain generic element of truth in part of these representations of the

[1] *Das Markusevangelium*, and *Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien*, pp. 548—561.

[2] *Das Nachapostolische Zeitalter*, pp. 456—475.

[3] *Der Ursprung und die Komposition der Synoptischen Evangelien*, pp. 310—385.

[4] Schwegler, *Das Nachapostolische Zeitalter*, p. 456.

[5] Ibid., pp. 474—481. See a shadow of the Tübingen idea cast before, in Owen's *Observations*, pp. 50, 51.

[6] *Der Ursprung*, p. 373.

school that surrounded F. C. Baur. Mark's Gospel *is* undoubtedly "neutral." It *is* 'colourless,' in relation to all grave party questions within the circle of the early churches. It *is* eminently "catholic." It *is* "irenic." It is also, at the same time, as Hilgenfeld represents it,[1] "Petrinic," though not in any one-sided, or obtrusive, or sectarian, or anti-Pauline sense. It is "Pauline" too, as Michelsen contends,[2] but in no anti-Petrine spirit. It is thoroughly unsectarian.

All this *may* be admitted, and *should* be admitted by all. It is patent. It lies on the surface of the Gospel. It wells up from its heart.

Nevertheless, there is not so much as one single stray straw of evidence that the Gospel of Mark occupied a position of mediation, or irenic neutrality, *in relation to the other two Synoptic Gospels.* It is in the mere wilfulness and wantonness of a creative imagination that its penman is depicted as warily steering his critical bark between some Scylla in Matthew's representations, and some Charybdis in Luke's. There is no Scylla in the representations of Matthew. It must be invented, if suspected. There is no Charybdis in the representations of Luke. It is only in the creative genius of critics, who must needs, apparently, invent something new. Neither is there any indication in Mark of wary steering, or of some latent aim of destination kept, like sealed orders, under lock and key. There is, in all the Gospels, perfect transparency and simplicity—"the simplicity that is in Christ." It is not needful to mine into profound depths, or to climb into giddy heights, in search of "tendency." No intricate involution, baffling to ordinary eyes, need be suspected. No divining power is required. There may have been, to a certain incidental degree, a desire, as Mill conjectured, to correct apocryphal or erroneous representations,[3] that were getting afloat over society. But doubtless the one dominant and overmastering aim would just be that of all the Apostles of our Lord, and of all, in all ages, who have imbibed aught of the apostolic spirit,—to tell for the sake of sinful and suffering humanity, the unvarnished but vivifying story of the life-and-death-work of Christ the Saviour.

---

[1] *Die Evangelien*, pp. 125—144.

[2] *Het Evangelie van Markus, Inleiding*, p. 4. "Our Mark," was written, he says, "door een christen uit de joden, doch niettemin een hevig aanhanger van Paulus."

[3] *Prolegomena*, § 111.

In other words, and in popular phraseology, the aim would be *to unfurl the banner of "the Gospel."*

The peculiar Tübingen theory has been repudiated and opposed by the illustrious Heinrich Ewald, in terms of the most stinging severity. The school from which it emanates is denounced by him,—we quote only some of his milder terms,—as "mischievous" and "false."[1] But in his own theory of the genetic inter-relationship of Mark to the other Gospels, he formed, as is his wont, such peculiarly vivid conceptions, that, to himself, they have started out from the canvas of his imagination, with all the self-evidencing or self-asserting authority of objective historical facts.

He postulates a considerable variety of documents or books, now lost, but more or less incorporated in our existing Gospels. The respective peculiarities of these books are, he conceives, clearly discernible in the party-coloured texture of the Synoptic Gospels. And hence, in the first edition of his excellent *Translation of the First Three Gospels*, the edition of 1850, the respective portions, which, as he conceives, had been derived from these prior works, are actually represented to the eye by being printed in *nine varieties of type*.

He holds, moreover, that there have been three distinct editions of Mark,—Mark *a*, Mark *b*, Mark *c*,—the second much altered from the first, though appearing only about a year later, and the third—which appeared in the second century—still further altered and impoverished.[2] In the second edition, as he supposes, there were numerous interpolations introduced from two still earlier Evangelical Documents, *the Oldest Gospel* (now lost)—the Gospel that was used, he is convinced, by the Apostle Paul,[3]—and *the Lord's Words* or the "*Spruchsammlung*" (also now lost).

In direct opposition, however, to the hypothesis of the Tübingen school and of Griesbach, Ewald maintains, strongly, that the Gospel of Mark was not only a thoroughly "original" work, but antecedent in date to the Gospels of both Matthew and Luke, and was used by these Evangelists in the composition of their respective books.

The entire theory of the distinguished author is emphatically his own; and—although in substance adopted by Meyer—it is likely, so far as its entirety is concerned, to remain exclusively his own. No other independent mind could be expected to accept it. Geniuses,

---

[1] *Die drei ersten Evangelien u. d. Apostelgeschichte (1871-72)*, I p. 2, 3.

[2] *Die drei ersten Evv.*, pp. 77—174.

[3] Ibid., p. 62.

who wander in orbits of infinite conjecture, differ from each other, like planet from planet, not only in bulk, substantiality, and the hue and intensity of their lustre, but also *in their paths*. Ewald's theory, therefore, must be left alone, in its peculiarity, as simply one of the memorable monuments which embody the outcome of his prolific and brilliant genius.

But how, then, are we to account for the remarkable coincidences that characterize the Synoptic Gospels? Whence the whole paragraphs of coincident phraseology? Whence the coincidences in detached and minute phrases, as for instance in Matthew xii, 13, Mark iii, 5, Luke vi, 10? Whence the coincidences, too, in the order or arrangement of the evangelical materials?

Eichhorn, for instance, gives a tabulated list of 44 Sections, which are parallel or coincident in the three Synoptic Gospels. In all these Sections, with the single exception of the 38th, the "order" of Mark and Luke is identical; and from the 20th onward, the order in the three Evangelists, with the single exception already specified, is one and the same.

Whence such coincidences?

It is not enough to refer the whole matter, with Gaussen[1] and others of the same school, to the sovereignty of divine Inspiration and Dictation. We believe devoutly in Inspiration. We believe, too, devoutly in occasional Dictation. "God hath spoken once," and again and again. (Psalm lxii, 11; Heb. i, 1.) He still speaks. His very works are words. He spoke and speaks through the Evangelists. Like the prophets of the older Dispensation, "they spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." (2 Pet. i, 21.) Doubtless the omnipresent Spirit is brooding and breathing everywhere; and he "blows where he listeth." (John iii, 8.) This, as we take it, is not a worn-out antiquated idea. It is a perennial truth,—just as really a dictate too of deep philosophy, as it is a doctrine of simple and biblical theology. If so, we shall not be astray in our thoughts, if we believe that the Living Spirit of Christianity was "blowing," 1850 years ago, in a gale—so to speak—of gracious agency along the plains and around the hills of Galilee and Judea. His influence, without stint, must undoubtedly have descended on the Christ, (John iii, 34), and would be "poured out" plenarily on his chosen representatives and commissioners. (Acts ii, 17, 18.) It

[1] *Théopneustie*, chap. i, § 4.

*actuated* the Apostles and Evangelists, but always—let it be carefully borne in mind—in perfect accordance with the divinely constituted laws of free and idiosyncratic observation of phenomena, colligation of facts, collation of particulars, logical classification, rhetorical combination, and literary representation. (1 Cor. xiv, 32.)

We return then to our inquiry. There must be 'a sufficient reason' to account for the literary coincidences of the Gospels. And it is becoming in us to search for it.

Le Clerc threw out the conjecture that the three Synoptic Evangelists may have derived their materials in common from the same human sources,—*the written Memoirs or Memorials of eye-and-ear-witnesses.*[1] Priestley reproduced the conjecture.[2] Koppe too reproduced it in part, contending in the Dissertation, to which we have already referred,[3] that Mark, so far from being a mere abbreviator of Matthew, never saw Matthew's Gospel. The coincidences between the two are, he conjectures, to be accounted for on the principle that they both drew from the same fountains, whether oral or written. Michaelis came to be of the same opinion substantially;—only he gave emphasis to the conviction, that it was "*written* Reports" *(schriftliche Nachrichten)*, of which the three evangelists made use. "None of the three evangelists," he says, "seems to have read the others' Gospels."[4] Semler,—though like 'a rolling stone' in his opinions,—gave, for a season, more definite shape to the conjecture, by saying that it was probable that all the three Synoptic Evangelists used various original Aramaic documents.[5] Lessing became more definite still, and conjectured that the basis of the three Synoptic

---

[1] "—quidni enim credamus, tria hæc evangelia partim petita esse ex simi-"libus aut iisdem fontibus, hoc est, e commentariis eorum, qui varios Christi "sermones audiverant, aut actorum ejus testes fuerant, eaque, ne oblivioni "traderentur, illico scriptis mandarant."—*Historia Ecclesiastica*, (1716), p. 429.

[2] He speaks of the Gospels as "originally written *in detached parts.* Some of these," he adds, "might have been committed to writing by the apostles themselves, and some by their auditors, corrected by themselves."—*Observations on the Harmony of the Gospels*, (1780), pp. 72, 73.

[3] Page xli.

[4] His own statement of the case has something in it of an Irish bull,—"die drei ersten Evangelisten einander nicht gelesen zu haben scheinen."—*Einleitung*, § 129, p. 929.

[5] See his notes to his *Townson's Abhandlungen über die vier Evangelien*, vol. I, pp. 146, 221, 290.

Gospels was the Aramaic Gospel spoken of by the Fathers as *the Gospel according to the Hebrews*, or—what was identical, as he contends—*the Gospel of the twelve apostles*.[1] Niemeyer took up the conjecture, and elaborated it, maintaining that the divergences of the existing Gospels are to be traced to different recensions of the primitive Aramaic Gospel.[2] And then the hypothesis, thus amplified, got into the hands of Eichhorn, who, with a consummate genius in the direction of ingenuity, elaborated it to its culminating point, during the process of a long series of years. He was able, he conceived, to reproduce the Original Document, or *Urevangelium*,—so far at least as its essential contents are concerned. It consisted, he supposed, of the sum of those forty-four[3] Sections of the history of our Lord, to which we have already made reference,[4] and which, in their substance, are common to all the three Synoptic Gospels. The additional Sections of the history, which are found, coincidently, not in all, but only in pairs of the Gospels,—as (1) in Matthew and Mark, (2) in Mark and Luke, and (3) in Matthew and Luke,—were documentary *Additions* or *Supplements*, incorporated in the particular copies or recensions which had come into the hands of the respective pairs of Evangelists. The Sections, again, which are peculiar to each of the Evangelists were, apparently, either peculiarities in his particular recension, or contributions from private sources of his own. Eichhorn is not quite positive about them.[5] But he is quite positive about the actual existence of the Aramaic *Urevangelium*, with different sets of *Additions* or *Interpolations* in different Copies,—such as *Copy A*—containing additions ultimately incorporated in Matthew, *Copy B*—containing additions ultimately incorporated in Luke, *Copy C*—combining both *A* and *B* and translated by Mark, *Copy D*—which, when combined with *B*, formed the basis of Luke's Gospel,

---

[1] "Matthæus, Marcus, Lucas sind nichts als verschiedene und nicht verschiedene Uebersetzungen der sogenannten hebräischen Urkunde des Matthäus, die jeder machte so gut er konnte."—*Neue Hypothese über die Evangelisten blos als menschliche Geschichtschreiber betrachtet*, (*1778*), § 50.

[2] *Conjecturæ ad illustrandum plurimorum N. T. Scriptorum silentium de primordiis vitæ Jesu Christi* (*1790*), pp. 8—10.

[3] *Forty-two* in his first draft.

[4] Page xlix.

[5] As to Mark, he says, "*Diese Stücke verrathen vielmehr einen eigen gestimmten Concipienten, von dem wir sonst weiter nichts besitzen. Ob nun dieser Concipient Markus selbst sey, oder eine von ihm verschiedene Person, muss man unentschieden lassen.*"—Einleitung, § 89, vol. I, p. 390.

while as combined with *A*, it formed the basis of the text of Matthew.[1] He also became positive—in the ultimate form of his theory—that, in addition to the Aramaic Additions in the various Codices referred to, there had got into circulation early Greek translations of *Copies A* and *D*.

Hence, as he concludes, the coincidences on the one hand, and the variations on the other, of our Canonical Gospels. All the coincidences are to be accounted for by the common possession of identical documents. The majority of the most important variations are to be attributed to the possession of one or more peculiar documents, on the part of each particular Evangelist.

We have referred to the ultimate form of Eichhorn's hypothesis. Intermediate between that form, and its original draft, Dr. Marsh's *Dissertation on the Origin and Composition of our Three First Canonical Gospels (1801)* came in.

Equal to Eichhorn in zeal, and possessed of an ingenuity which, if not so inventive, was yet as keen in its edge, and more critically consistent in its application, Dr. Marsh supplied several of the steps, by means of which Eichhorn at last mounted to the pinnacle and consummation of his theory.

The phase of the theory, as it left the hands of Dr. Marsh, may be learned from his own deliberate deliverance:—"St. Matthew, St. "Mark, and St. Luke, all three, used copies of the common Hebrew "document 'ℵ,'—the materials of which St. Matthew, who wrote in "Hebrew, retained in the language, in which he found them, but St. "Mark and St. Luke translated them into Greek. They had no "knowledge of each others' Gospels; but St. Mark and St. Luke, "beside their copies of the Hebrew document 'ℵ,' used a Greek trans- "lation of it, which had been made, before any of the additions 'α,' "'β,' 'γ,' 'A,' 'B,' 'Γ' had been inserted. Lastly, as the Gospels of "St. Mark and St. Luke contain Greek translations of Hebrew "materials, which were incorporated into St. Matthew's Hebrew "Gospel, the person, who translated St. Matthew's Hebrew Gospel "into Greek, frequently derived assistance from the Gospel of St. "Mark, where St. Mark had matter in common with St. Matthew: "and in those places, but in those places only, where St. Mark had no "matter in common with St. Matthew, he had frequently recourse to "St. Luke's Gospel."[2]

---

[1] *Einleitung*, § 84, pp. 372—375.

[2] *Dissertation*, chap. xv, p. 195.

But the theory culminated, as we have intimated, in the hands of Eichhorn. It thenceforward became arrested. Though somewhat simplified by Gratz,[1] and defended, with reservations that turned longingly to the future for light, by Bertholdt,[2] it ceased to undergo development. It ceased to thrive. It ceased by and by to live; and now, in Germany, it is nothing more than a Memory or literary Mummy.

No wonder. For, although it involves elements, which need not and should not be called in question, it is yet, as a developed hypothesis of the genetic relationship of the Gospels, very far indeed from being satisfactory: and especially in its most developed or culminated form. It is, in the *first* place, too artificial by far. In the *second* place, it is a mere pile of conjectures, with no unchallengeable basis in historic fact. The postulated documents are never referred to by 'the ancients.' No trace of their existence is found—*except in the theory*. In the *third* place, it is unnaturally complicated,—bristling cumbrously with its tabulated codices. And then, in the *fourth* place, it is essentially only a transition-theory, that was destined, in its very nature, to be left behind, 'high and dry,' in the rapid succession of hypotheses. It proceeds,—at all events in its fully developed form,—on the assumption that the Synoptic Evangelists were dependent, for their materials, *on written documents*. And this assumption, by removing the Canonical biographers of our Lord to a distance from the fountains of primary knowledge, leads, by a short route, to the surmise that the Gospels, attributed to them, were not their own compositions, but supposititious products of a later age. This surmise has been actually evolved, and is, at present, quite a postulate with a certain circle of theorists. It is claimed by F. C. Baur, and the adherents of his school, as the legitimate finding of distinctively *historical criticism*.

Unless some such claim shall be conceded, the Eichhorn-hypothesis of *a Gospel beneath our Gospels* terminates abruptly,—somewhat like a flight of stairs, that should have led somewhither, but that is actually broken off before any landing-place can be reached.

The claim, however, cannot be conceded. It is at utter variance with real history. It is a kind of outrage on it. It is at utter variance, too, with the possibilities even of that ideal history, which

---

[1] *Neuer Versuch die Entstehung der drey ersten Evangelien zu erklären (1812)*. See in particular §§ 26, 27.

[2] *Einleitung*, § 329, vol. III, pp. 1249, 1250.

is so highly prized. It comes into collision with the principle of *a sufficient reason*, or *the law that effects must have adequate causes*. It makes it impossible to find a sufficient reason, or an adequate cause, for the actual form which was assumed by post-apostolic Christian literature. That literature, amid many glaring excrescences, and a strange combination of crudities and senilities, together with other imperfections, is pervaded by a spirit of reverence for our existing Gospels, and is frequently saturated with the expressed juices, not only of their general essence, but of their particular contents. It demands, therefore, as the indispensable condition of its existence, the pre-existence of the Gospels, as we have them.

In another respect, too, is this *historical criticism* unhistorical and unphilosophical. It leaves unaccounted-for the unanimity of the Christian churches of the second century in regard to the great outstanding Christological phenomena, which constitute the essence of the Gospels. For, while there were manifold diversities of speculation in reference to the interpretation of these phenomena, there was remarkable unity,—attested even by the vagaries of heretics, and the objections of heathens,—in reference to the actual occurrence of the facts, or the doing of the works, and the speaking of the words ascribed to our Lord.

Indeed, the theory leaves unaccounted for the deeply imbedded unanimity in Christological essentials that underlies all the varied developments of Christian life, Christian speculation, and Christian organization, in all the succeeding centuries. The peculiarities of the present century demand, as part of their sufficient reason, the antecedent peculiarities of the century that preceded. The peculiarities of that preceding century demand for their adequate cause the presence of the antecedent peculiarities of the century that went before. And so the regress continues, until we arrive at the peculiarities of the second century, which demand in the Christian, as in all the other spheres of actual experience, a sufficient reason for themselves in something that is comprehensive of the antecedent peculiarities of the first. But that sufficient reason can never be found, if the facts that are embodied in the existing Gospels be ignored. And when we get into the sphere of these facts, it would be utterly unaccountable if the Matthew of the first century, who had the full use of his own eyes and ears, and the Mark of that same century, who had the privilege of being associated with probably all the apostles, and certainly with Peter, on terms of intimacy, were yet dependent for their narrations on some prior Gospel and connected Supplements, out of which they

had painfully to weave the texture of their immortal compositions.—The actual coincidences of the Synoptics must be sought for in some other cause than in the common possession of an *Aramaic Urevangelium*, now lost.

What then is this cause? Many of late have looked, or are still looking for it, *in Mark's own Gospel*. They suppose that that Gospel has been, either in its present, or in some prior form, the Original, or Archetype, out of which the Gospels of both Matthew and Luke were developed.

This Mark-hypothesis was Storr's theory. He handled it reverently, —but immaturely too.[1] It slumbered in its immaturity for long after the decease of Storr. But in the year 1838 it woke up in full maturity, and,—strange to say,—in two independent forms.

In that year Wilke published his *Urevangelist*,[2] and maintained, in an elaborate induction of particulars, and by most vigorous if not rigorous processes of argumentation, that our Canonical Mark was *the Original Evangelist*, from the fountain of whose narrative both Matthew and Luke drew almost all their waters. He held, however, that Luke was anterior to Matthew, so that Matthew had not only the fountain of Mark from which to draw, but also the intermediate cistern of Luke.

Weisse, again, in the same year, published his still more elaborate *Gospel History, critically and philosophically handled*,[3] in which, with still more comprehensive sweep of minutely detailed criticism, he contended, as zealously as Wilke, for the priority of Mark's Gospel, as we have it, to both Matthew's and Luke's,—maintaining at the same time, just as Wilke does, that the compilers of these latter Gospels drew from the storehouse of the former. But, in contrariety to the simpler theory of Wilke, he likewise maintained that both Matthew and Luke availed themselves, in addition, of the Aramaic *Oracles* ascribed by Papias to Matthew,—the *Spruchsammlung* of which we have spoken in our notice of the hypothesis of Ewald. He contended,

---

[1] *Ueber den Zweck der evangelischen Geschichte und der Briefe Johannis (1786)*, pp. 274 ff. See also his Prolusio *de fonte evangeliorum Matthæi et Lucæ (1794)* in Velthusen, Kuinol, and Ruperti's Commentt. Theoll. vol. III; likewise his *Opuscula Academica*, vol. III, p. 66.

[2] *Der Urevangelist, oder exegetisch kritische Untersuchung über das Verwandtschaftsverhältniss der drei ersten Evangelien.*

[3] *Die evangelische Geschichte kritisch und philosophisch bearbeitet.* (Zwei Bände.)

moreover, that Matthew and Luke wrote quite independently of one another, so that neither of the two made use of the other's cistern. In a subsequent publication, the able and conscientious author,—influenced by the representations and reasonings of Ewald,—so far modified his theory, retrogressively, as to hold that Mark's Gospel, as we now have it, is not so full or rich as it was at the time when Matthew and Luke unitedly drew from its well-spring.[1]

Thiersch, in the main, has followed in the wake of Wilke and Weisse,—of Wilke in particular.[2]

So, in a sense, has Smith of Jordanhill; but independently, and by means of self-originated research. He supposes, as we have already noted,[3] that Mark's Gospel is merely *Mark's Translation of Peter's Original Aramaic Gospel.* He holds that it was the Aramaic Original, which both Matthew and Luke made use of;—Matthew first, and then Luke, who had in his hands not merely Peter's Original document, but also our present Canonical *Gospel according to Matthew*, or Matthew's Greek Translation of his own prior Aramaic Gospel.

Holtzmann[4] again,—who has expended on the subject a vast amount of laborious study and research,—supposes, in agreement with Weisse, and in opposition to Wilke and Smith, that he is able to demonstrate that the Gospels of Matthew and Luke are mutually independent. He holds, however, in agreement at once with Wilke and Smith, as well as Weisse, that they are respectively secondary compositions, reflecting the shadows of prior evangelical writings. Our Canonical Mark also, he holds, is as really secondary as either Matthew or Luke. All the three Synoptics are compositions at second hand. At the basis of them all is an Original Mark, or *Urmarcus*,—of which, however, very special advantage was taken by the Canonical Mark, and hence the transmission of the name; while the Canonical Matthew and Luke had the advantage of using another important evangelical document, a Greek version of the *Oracles*, or *Spruchsammlung*, which, in its original Aramaic form, was ascribed by Papias to the apostle Matthew. This *Collection of the Oracles of the Lord* constituted, says Holtzmann, the Original Matthew, or *Urmatthäus*, and was freely used by both the Canonical Matthew and

[1] *Die Evangelienfrage in ihrem gegenwärtigen Stadium (1856)*, pp. 156 ff.

[2] *Die Kirche im apostolischen Zeitalter und die Entstehung der neutestamentlichen Schriften (1858)*, p. 102.

[3] Pages xxviii, xxxi.

[4] *Die Synoptischen Evangelien, ihr Ursprung und geschichtlicher Charakter (1863).*

the Canonical Luke,—but to a greater extent by the latter than by the former.[1] The Canonical Mark had not, it seems, the advantage of being acquainted with the work, and hence that comparative paucity of the words of the Saviour, which is characteristic of his Gospel.

More recent investigators are still out at sea, and refuse to follow in the wake of either Wilke, Weisse, or Holtzmann.

Klostermann, for example, abjures the idea of an *Original Mark* now lost. He believes that the Canonical Mark is the Mark of Papias. But he maintains its dependent or secondary relationship to Matthew.[2]

In this last particular he treads in the footsteps of Augustin in ancient times, as also of Hilgenfeld in modern times, who, in a long series of consecutive treatises, maintains that Mark made use of Matthew, while he still more emphatically and persistently maintains, in opposition to Griesbach and F. C. Baur, that he did not make use of Luke.

Volkmar, too, like Klostermann,—though belonging to a totally different school,—abandons the idea of an *Original* or *Chrysalis Mark;* though he holds that it is not unlikely that the Canonical Mark made use of the Canonical Luke, while it is certain, he supposes, that he made use of four of Paul's epistles, as also of "the bitterly anti-Pauline Apocalypse."[3]

Michelsen of Holland, on the other hand, contends, confidently, for a succession of Marks. He is certain, indeed, that both Matthew and Luke had before them the two editions. Matthew, however, as he conceives, more frequently followed Mark the First, while Luke, in general, gave the preference to Mark the Second.[4]

Scholten followed Michelsen, and is equally positive that there was an Original or protoplasmic Mark, the precursor of the Canonical. Indeed it must have been, as he represents it, of a very humble chrysalis character. It was, however, one of the chief sources of Matthew. But, then, be it remembered, there were three successive

---

[1] *Die Synoptischen Evangelien*, pp. 128, 162, &c.

[2] *Das Markusevangelium nach seinem Quellenwerthe für die evangelische Geschichte (1867).*

[3] *Die Evangelien, oder Marcus und die Synopsis der kanonischen und ausserkanonischen Evangelien, nach dem ältesten Text, mit historisch-exegetischen Commentar (1870)*, p. 646.

[4] *Het Evangelie van Markus (1867).*

Matthews,—Matthew-the-First (*i. e.* the *Oracles*), Matthew-the-Second (drawn from Mark-the-First, and the Oracles, and another original Gospel now lost), and Matthew-the-Third, or our Canonical *Gospel according to Matthew* (containing, in addition to the three constituent elements specified, some pieces or patches of anecdote unknown to Luke).[1]

A far more reverent spirit is that of Dr. Bernard Weiss, who has devoted himself to the study of this question for a long series of years, and has recently published an elaborate work on Mark.[2] He has, however, a complicated theory of his own. He turns back to the testimony of 'the fathers,' and believes, in accordance with the general tradition, that Mark's Gospel was inspired by the direct teaching of Peter. So far good. But running—too artificially as we conceive—in the groove of the Mark-hypothesis, he also believes that the Gospel, as thus inspired by the chief of the original apostles, "lies at the basis" of the other two Synoptic Gospels, and gave rise to "their entire inner economy." But he believes, still further, that the problem of the inter-relationship of the three Gospels can never be solved, unless we postulate, with Holtzmann, that there was a still earlier apostolic document, which was made use of by all the three evangelists, viz. a Greek translation of that original Aramaic writing of Matthew, which is spoken of by Papias, *the Oracles of the Lord*. It was because this was largely absorbed in the first Canonical Gospel, that occasion was given to the name—*the Gospel according to 'Matthew.'* This earliest of all the evangelical documents, is, as Weiss holds, 'the missing link,' after which the hands of Lessing, Eichhorn, Marsh, and their followers, were anxiously groping, but which, unhappily for the success of their critical researches, eluded their grasp.

We cannot say that we are satisfied with the 'Mark-hypothesis' in any of its forms, or with any of the other hypotheses which we have passed under review. They are all too artificial. At the best, they are mere and indeterminate phases of possibilities.

There is, from the nature of the case, something insoluble in the problem, which Weiss, Volkmar, Michelsen, Klostermann, Holtz-

---

[1] *Het Oudste Evangelie, critisch onderzoek naar de samenstelling, de onderlinge verhouding, de historische waarde en den oorsprong der evangeliën naar Mattheus en Marcus (1868)*, pp. 70—72, &c.

[2] *Das Marcusevangelium und seine synoptischen Parallelen (1872)*.

mann, Ewald, Weisse, Wilke, Eichhorn, Marsh, Griesbach, Augustin have worked at, and resolved to solve. It is no marvel that they have failed. It is no marvel that every truly independent investigator has seen that all his predecessors have failed. It is no marvel that, while shaft after shaft has been eagerly sunk into the depths, in hope of finding beneath what might explain at once the correspondences and the variations that are patent on the surface, the depths have refused to yield up their secret. The moment one begins to work below, he works in comparative darkness, with only a glimpse of light to guide his operations. He works, moreover, in a sphere, in which, even had he a full blaze of light, it would be impossible to discover the whole of the coexisting factors, which are needed to account, at once for the '*common* places' or coincidences, and the '*peculiar*-places' or variations of the Gospels.

It is, and must ever remain, an impossibility for any intelligence, short of approximate omniscience, to ascertain by retrospective vision all the factors involved. The retrospective vision must turn out, from the very necessities of the case, to be mere guessing in the dark.

Even a witness in a court of law, if he has a long story to tell twice, will produce a minglement of coincidences and variations, which postulate as their factors multitudinous, and in many cases evanescent and subtle conditions, which it might baffle the most judicial and judicious of judges to unravel and enumerate.

Even the same author, if not trusting to a stereotypical memory, will be —perhaps unconsciously—the subject of different factors of representation, when, at different times and in different circumstances, he presents the story of his experience or information. Witness, for example, the Apostle Paul's accounts of his 'apprehension' by the Saviour on the road to Damascus, as given, the one to the people of Jerusalem, while he stood on the stair of the castle of Antonia (recorded in Acts xxii), and the other, in the presence of King Agrippa at Cæsarea (recorded in Acts xxvi). Compare, moreover, both of these accounts with that of Luke in the ninth chapter of the Acts,—an account no doubt furnished to the faithful historian from the mouth of the apostle himself. The factors that influenced rhetorical or literary representation were, of necessity, peculiar in each case, and produced the noteworthy variations which occur in each of the accounts. But certain of the factors were uniform throughout, and hence not only the essential harmony of the accounts, but also the coincidences in particular items of the phraseology. Yet who could now reproduce the sum-total of the factors? And how exceedingly cumbrous, artificial,

absurd, and comical it would be to proceed on the assumption, that to account for the coincidences and variations, a complex series of prior documents, or *Urdocumente* must be postulated, out of one or more of which something must have been derived to all the representations,—while the variations are to be accounted for on the assumption that Urdocument A was not followed in the one case, while Urdocument B was substituted in its place, and Urdocument C was overlaid while Urdocument B was being used.

The factors of rhetorical or literary representation, that produce coincidences, and sometimes even lengthened harmonies or identities, are not always or necessarily documentary. Especially was this the case in an age when the facilities for actual penmanship were comparatively few and rare, and among a people who did not enjoy the advantage of being trained to the use of 'letters.' Take our old Scottish ballads for example. It was long ere some of them, at least, were committed to writing. Bard handed them down to bard, and when the bards died out, amateurs of less practised memories kept hold of them, often with remarkable tenacity as regards essence and substance, though not with uniform identity as regards every word, line, rhyme, or verse.

It is suggestive to take note, moreover, of the peculiarities or idiosyncrasies of story-tellers. Some cannot repeat the same story twice in identical terms. Others cannot repeat the same story at all except in identical terms. Even when it is given by them at second-hand, the identical terms of the first narrator are, —in the salient points at least,—faithfully reproduced. A third class of story-tellers swing alternately toward either pole of peculiarity.

It is the same with preachers of the Gospel. While some seldom, if ever, repeat themselves in phraseology; others, except when in special circumstances, slide insensibly, and as it were inevitably, into repetition.

In 'free' or 'extemporary' prayer, too, there is, with some, a continual up-welling of originality, while with others there is but little that is really 'extemporary' and 'free,' beyond a certain limited latitude in adjustment. There are in their memory actual forms or formularies of adoration and petitions, which are repeated and re-repeated with precision.

These phenomena of retentiveness or adhesiveness of memory are quite common, and would be far more so, when writing was cumbrous on the one hand, and a rare accomplishment on the other; and

when, besides, there was but a slender apprehension and appreciation of the charm of phraseological variety.

The phraseological coincidences, therefore, of the Synoptic Evangelists do not absolutely demand, for their explication, the hypothesis of some original document or documents possessed in common by them all.

It is admitted on all hands that, at a very early period, there were other documents in existence besides our extant Gospels. Luke, in his Introduction, makes express mention of them. "*Many*," says he, "have taken in hand to set forth in order an account of those things "that have been accomplished among us" (i, 1). It is most reasonable to suppose that there might have been, and indeed must have been, soon after the Saviour's decease, if not in some instances even before it, various epistolary or anecdotical and semi-biographical accounts of his marvellous career, circulating in those spheres of society which had felt the thrill of his words and works. But we have no reason to suppose that Matthew, for instance, would be much dependent on such writings for the materials of his Gospel. He had been, himself, an eye-and-ear witness of the works and words. And he was living in the closest intimacy with those who could assist his memory, or furnish him with information on facts beyond the sphere of his personal cognisance. Mark too, we have found reason to believe,[1] could not be, to a very large degree, dependent on such partial and casual Memoirs, Records, or Reports. He drew fresh from the fountain of one, who had enjoyed peculiarly favourable opportunities of acting as a privileged eye-and-ear witness.

We may presume, therefore, that both Matthew and Mark trusted much to memory,—the one to his own, the other to the memory of Peter.

But still we need not imagine that Matthew trusted exclusively to his own recollections, as distinguished from the recollections of his brethren in the apostleship; or that Mark trusted wholly to the memory of Peter. Such an idea of the state of the case would be an unnatural narrowing and limiting of the factors of literary reproduction and representation.

Doubtless, the first apostolic narrations of the Gospel would be oral. Herder was right in giving emphasis to this idea.[2] The

---

[1] See pages xx—xxxviii.

[2] See especially his *Regel der Zusammenstimmung unsrer Evangelien, aus ihrer Entstehung und Ordnung (1797)*, at the beginning.

Apostles and their helpers went about *preaching the Gospel by word of mouth*. They proclaimed it as 'from the house-tops.' And when they passed beyond the little circles of those who had known by personal observation, or popular hearsay, the particulars of the Saviour's extraordinary career, they would be called upon, by such as became disciples or catechumens, to tell in detail the story of the unique and marvellous life.

As happens, however, in all such cases, those who—like Peter—could report their observations, and express their conceptions, with facility and force, would give literary shape to the story. The others, who had, in their nature, more of the faculty of *re*production or *re*presentation, and less of the power of primary or original presentation, would follow in the footsteps of their leaders. Not slavishly however,—surely we may suppose. All the eye-and-ear witnesses would, we may presume, contribute somewhat to the grand result. But as apostle listened to apostle, narrating to the assembled disciples what their Lord had done and said and suffered, the specific forms of 'setting' the scenes, and even, in many cases, of 'putting' the minute details of the scenes, would, when vivid or striking, be appreciated, remembered, by and by reproduced, and at length regularly and with only partial and occasional variations, repeated. The narratives would gradually run into moulds which would, in course of time, become stereotypical.

This is, in substance, Gieseler's hypothesis, to account at once for the coincidences and for the variations of the Synoptic Gospels.[1] It no doubt contains in itself a large proportion of the realities of the case. But we see no good reason for isolating the indubitable factors it embraces from other possibilities and probabilities. Some of the "numerous" Memoirs, Narratives, or Reports, which were lying before Luke (i, 1), or which were circulating in other circles, may have been known to Matthew and Mark, and may have had an influence on their minds and pens. These very documents may indeed have been second-hand reflections, and thus more or less correctly-taken literary photographs of the very rehearsals which the apostles —inclusive of Matthew himself, and of Peter in particular—had been accustomed to make in the meetings of the catechumens. *Most probably all of them would be of this description.* And if so, it is no violent stretch of imagination to suppose that they might,

[1] *Historisch-kritischer Versuch über die Entstehung und die frühesten Schicksale der schriftlichen Evangelien (1818).*

in their distinctive individualities, have contributed their appreciable, though now indeterminable quota of influence in giving shape and fixity to certain moulds of presentation and certain methods of arrangement.

The Higher Hand should never be ignored or overlooked. It was, it is, always operative, though it does not do everything, or supersede the unfettered activity of human hands, and heads, and hearts. Indeed, if there was a special divine manifestation in Him who was himself *the Living Word*, it is reasonable to suppose that there would be a correlative divine manifestation in *the written word*. To fulfil the ends contemplated in the appearance of the *Impersonated Word*, the mirror of the *impersonal word* was required, in which, not his flitting shadow alone, but the fixed photograph of his glory, might from age to age be contemplated. We have the mirror. We have the fixed photograph. Indeed we have Synoptic photographs; and others besides. Their variety is beautiful. Their unembarrassed harmony is perfect. The hands of the human artists had not a little to do in the matter of arrangement and adjustment. But, for the 'speaking likenesses' or 'express images,' which come out in their pages, we are indebted to the irradiation of that very Light from heaven, which is "the true Light that lighted" the Evangelists, and that still, though in a secondary way, "lighteth every man that cometh into the world."

## §. 9. Date of the Gospel.

It is not possible, at present, to determine the particular year of the publication of the Gospel. Not even is it possible to determine the decade of years, within which the publication must have taken place. All is mere conjecture regarding years and decades.

Of conjecture, however, there has been no lack.

The majority of conjecturists have taken their cue from the statement of Irenæus, which has been already, in a former Section of this *Introduction*,[1] passed under review. That early father says, according to the currently received text of his *Work against Heresies*, that "*after the departure of Peter and Paul*, Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, even he delivered to us in writing the things which

[1] Pages xxiv—xxvii.

"were preached by Peter." On the assumption that the word "*departure*" refers to the *decease* of the Apostles named, the publication of the Gospel has been connected with the date of Peter's martyrdom. That tragical event,—with which the martyrdom of Paul is, according to the current ecclesiastical tradition, supposed to have been either precisely[1] or very nearly coincident,—is generally or rather indeed unanimously assigned to the seventh decade of the first Christian century. The narrative concerning Paul in the *Acts of the Apostles* brings down the progress of events to the two years, during which he dwelt, as a prisoner at large, "in his own hired house" in Rome. These two years are supposed by Spanheim, Pearson, Tillemont, Bertholdt, Köhler, Feilmoser, Anger, Conybeare-and-Howson, to extend from A.D. 61 to A.D. 63. According to Hug, Schmidt, de Wette, Schrader, Schott, Ewald, Meyer, they extend from 62 to 64. According to Ussher, Michaelis, Heinrichs, Eichhorn, Olshausen, Sanclemente, Ideler, they extend from 63 to 65. Paul was martyred, according to Schrader, in the year 64;[2] according to Lardner, either in 64 or 65;[3] according to Hemsen, either toward the close of 65 or toward the beginning of 66;[4] according to Patrizi, in the summer of 67;[5] according to Conybeare-and-Howson, in the summer of 68.[6] Soon thereafter, and no doubt within the seventh decade of the century,—if the chronology of Irenæus were correct,—must *the Gospel according to Mark* have been published. Hug, in the earlier editions of his *Introduction*, fixed on the year 69. "The publication," he said, "took place in the sixty-ninth year after the birth, and in the thirty-seventh year after the death, of Jesus."[7] But he ultimately saw reason to conclude that there is no real historic ground on which to determine the precise year.[8]

He was right. The coincidence of the martyrdoms of Paul and Peter in Rome is by no means a settled historical fact. And though it were, the chronological connection with it of the publication of

---

[1] ἐμαρτύρησαν κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρόν,—says Dionysius, bishop of Corinth in the 2nd century. See *Eusebius's Hist. Eccles.* ii, 25.

[2] *Der Apostel Paulus*, vol. I, p. 264.

[3] *History of the Apostles and Evangelists*, chap. xi. *Works*, vol. VI, pp. 300, 301, ed. 1788.

[4] *Der Apostel Paulus*, p. 742.

[5] *De Evangeliis*, vol. I, p. 42.

[6] *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, vol. II, pp. 502, 560, ed. 1855.

[7] *Einleitung*, vol. II, § 31.

[8] *Einleitung*, 4th ed., vol. II, § 32.

Mark's Gospel rests only on the statement of Irenæus. And, in this statement, he is contradicted by counter statements on the part of Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Epiphanius, and Jerome, which have apparently as much title, as the asseveration to which they are opposed, to be regarded as authoritative and correct.

Irenæus's asseveration, then, must, in the present state of patristic criticism, be held in abeyance. Patrizi contends strenuously that it must be set aside; and reasoning on Christophorson's reading of the text, he fixes on the latter half of the year A.D. 42, or the former half of the year 43, as the date of the publication of Mark's Gospel.[1] This is, however, a mere conjecture of the distinguished Roman chronologist,—a conjecture toppling on the point of a critical needle.

The conjecture, however, did not originate with Patrizi. The same date is found in the colophon of several respectable manuscripts of the Gospel, including the uncials GKS. In these manuscripts there is an express statement to the effect that the Gospel *was published ten years after the ascension of Christ,* that is, in the year 43.

Storr,[2] long ago, so far agrees with Patrizi and these manuscripts, as to contend for a very early date. He supposed that the work was published in Antioch, soon after "the men of Cyprus and Cyrene," who were scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen, "came to Antioch and spake unto the Grecians, preaching the Lord Jesus." (Acts xi, 19, 20.) He connected this occurrence regarding some *men of Cyrene* with the statement in Mark xv, 21, "And they impress one Simon *a Cyrenian,* who was passing by, coming out of the country, *the father of Alexander and Rufus,* to bear his cross." Storr thinks it probable that Alexander and Rufus were among *the men of Cyrene* who went to Antioch; and hence,—as he supposes,—Mark's mention of them in connection with their father. This is, however, just another needle point of conjectural criticism:—no more.

T. R. Birks, also, pleads for an early date of publication. He thinks that "the second Gospel was written by John Mark, about the "year A.D. 48, and probably at Cæsarea, with a reference, not only "to Jewish believers, but to Gentile Roman converts, who would

---

[1] See his Dissertation *Quando scripserit Marcus,* pp. 36—51 of the 1st vol. of his *De Evangeliis.*

[2] *Ueber den Zweck der evangelischen Geschichte u. Briefe Johannis,* pp. 278 ff.

"have multiplied there in seven or eight years from the conversion of "Cornelius."[1] It is an ingenious conjecture, reverently wrought out, but resting, we fear, like Storr's, on not much broader evidence than can rest on the point of another needle.

Volkmar, fixing on a later date, is far more definite and positive on the 'point.' "The time of publication," he says, "is easily and indubitably determined."[2] Easily! Indubitably! How? For the strangest of reasons, reader. Only turn to Mark i, 13, and you have it, half-hidden in a mystery, but self-revealing to the initiated. Do we not read there that Jesus was "in the wilderness, *forty days*, tempted of Satan"? To be sure we do: but what of that? Why, it is obvious—contends Volkmar—that there must be a deep significance in that particular number of days. Moses too was *forty days* in the wilderness (Ex. xxxiv, 28). Elijah also was *forty days* in the wilderness (1 Kings xix, 8). And the people of Israel were *forty years* in the wilderness (Numb. xiv, 33). What could be clearer and more indubitable to the initiated? The days of the Saviour's trial were *forty*, in order to cast shadows both behind and before. And they obviously therefore foreshadow *forty years* of trial to his people after his decease on the cross in the year 33,—forty years to be succeeded by that glorious coming which was to take place before all the personal disciples of the Lord "tasted of death" (Mark ix, 1). Add then 40 to 33, and "the birth-year of the book"[3] is at once determined—73! This needle—need we say—has a very sharp point indeed.—It pierces the 'wind-bag' that is pressed upon it.

The critics of the Tübingen school project the date of composition and publication far beyond A.D. 73. They admit that the original Mark of Papias must have belonged to the first century; but they contend that the Canonical Gospel, which superseded the original, cannot have been earlier than the second. Köstlin comes to the conclusion that it emerged in the first decade of the second century.[4] Dr. Davidson would date it "about A.D. 120."[5] Others of the school would carry the date still farther forward, say to some point or other between A.D. 130 and A.D. 150.

---

[1] *Horæ Evangelicæ*, p. 238.

[2] *Marcus und die Synopsis*, p. 646.

[3] "Geburtsjahr des Buches."—*Marcus, &c.*, pp. 49, 50.

[4] *Der Ursprung und die Komposition der Syn. Evv.*, pp. 384, 385.

[5] *Introduction*, vol. II, p. 111.

But this entire theory of the supersession and absorption of the Original Gospel of Mark by a fictitious Gospel of the second century, rests on another needle-point. It rests on the assumption of the soundness of Strauss's theory. It assumes that the mythical interpretation of the Gospel-History is substantially correct, though incomplete as originally propounded by its author, and needing, for its complement, the establishment of the inauthenticity of the four Canonical Gospels. Hence the literary task assigned to itself by the school:—*Let the inauthenticity of the Gospels be made out! There cannot have been miracles. Paulus's method of reducing the supernatural to the natural is absurd and grotesque. Therefore the Gospels we possess cannot be of apostolic origin or authority. They must have been—must they not?—only pious frauds, originating in a time far removed from the days of the apostles!*

But the assumption of a fictitious Gospel according to Mark, composed by a well-meaning impostor of the second century,—though essential, along with corresponding assumptions in reference to Matthew, Luke, and John, to the validity of Strauss's theory,—is itself, so far as the scientific determination of the date of our Canonical Gospel is concerned, nothing better than a mere unhistorical assumption, a dogmatic prepossession. It is in fact a critical myth. As unlikely too, as it is unhistorical. For where can be found even so much as a needle-point's breadth of probability, that a Gospel, originated in the apostolic circle, and bearing what was equivalent to the imprimatur of the chief of the Original Apostles, could, in the course of the second century, be, not only unceremoniously but also unanimously, laid aside, to make room for an upstart composition, written by nobody knows who, but filchingly bearing the honoured name of the genuine original document? Where is there any point at all of probability that all the churches in all parts of the world would or could, with all their bishops and other leaders, agree to make such an exchange of the old Gospel for the new, without a single dissentient voice being raised in remonstrance? Whence the probability, or possibility, of such absolutely universal approbation of faithlessness and falsification? How, too, could it happen that all the copies of the Original Gospel should have been not only superseded and shelved, but annihilated, so that, at the present day, not a single transcript, or fragment of one, can be found? How could it come to pass that, in the midst of the keen conflicts and mutual jealousies that abounded toward the conclusion of the second century, there should be a perfectly unani-

mous consent that never would one word be written about the substitution of the false for the true Gospel, so that all the records that would likely go down to posterity, should be entirely destitute of any note or hint on the subject? How could all these improbabilities and impossibilities become actualities? Echo answers "How?"

But are there, then, no data at all on which an approximate date may be assigned to the composition and publication of Mark's Gospel?

There are.

There is nothing indeed, as we have already intimated, that will afford a warrant to fix on any given year or decade of years. But the succession of patristic testimonies back to Papias, as exhibited in the 6th Section of this *Introduction*, makes it certain that the Gospel was in existence, and well known during the first century of the Christian era.

Since, moreover, it is all but certain that the John Mark of *the Acts of the Apostles* was the writer of the Gospel, and since it is probable that he was "a young man" at the time of the Crucifixion, and at the time consequently when he was assumed by Paul and Barnabas as their ministerial attendant, we may reasonably suppose that he would not defer the composition of his Gospel till he was overtaken by extreme old age. If he did not, then we have something like a foothold on which to reach some data for an approximate date. It is not likely, at all events, that the composition of the Gospel would be deferred to a period later than the year 70, the date of the overthrow of Jerusalem. Indeed it is most unlikely that it would be deferred till that period. If Mark was about twenty years of age at the time of the Crucifixion, he would be nearly sixty about the year 70.

Besides, there seems to be, in the peculiar inter-stratification of the contents of the 13th chapter of the Gospel,—the prophetical chapter,—taken in conjunction with the statement in chap. ix, 1, "*Verily I say unto you, that there be some that stand here, who shall not taste of death, till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power*," evidence on which we may, with probability, support the conclusion, that Mark, at the time he composed his Gospel, connected in his mind, as a matter of "private interpretation" and expectation, the glorious personal appearing of our Lord with the anticipated destruction of Jerusalem. The precise "times and seasons" were not distinctly and minutely unrolled to the eyes of Evangelists and Apostles. The prophetical perspective did not show the length of the intervals that intervened along the path of the future; and the inspired writers were con-

sequently left, like the prophets of old, to "search what and what manner of times" were referred to. This being the case, there is, in the inter-stratification referred to, evidence that increases the probability that the Gospel must have been written before the year 70.

There is another incidental item of evidence that leans and leads—very decidedly—toward the same conclusion. It is found in the verse which occasioned Storr's theory, viz. chap. xv, 21, "and they impress "one Simon a Cyrenian, who was passing by, coming out of the "country, *the father of Alexander and Rufus*, to bear his cross." Why should the evangelist particularise the fact that Simon of Cyrene was *the father of Alexander and Rufus?* Obviously, as Grotius remarks, because *Alexander* and *Rufus* were living at the time when the Gospel was published. Simon himself seems to have been deceased. His identity is remembered by means of his surviving sons. He would probably be in middle life, or beyond it, when he undertook his journey to the city of his fathers to celebrate the passover. But it was "the beginning of days" to him; and not to himself only, it would appear, but to all his household. His sons became men of mark in the Christian circle. It would however be quite improbable and unnatural to go forward to a period near the close of the century for the time of their prominence. A period before the destruction of Jerusalem is far more likely to have been the season when they were conspicuous. At all events, we could not, with the least shadow of probability, pass the terminating decades of the first century, and go over into the second. The Tübingen date must of necessity be abandoned.

## §. 10. The Place of the Gospel's Publication, and the Language in which it was originally written.

As to the *place* where the Gospel of Mark was originally circulated, nothing can be positively determined. We have seen, incidentally,[1] that Storr conjectured it to be Antioch, and that Birks conjectures it to be Cæsarea. The ancients in general assumed it to be Rome. Chrysostom, however, in the Introduction to his *Homiletical Exposition of Matthew*, mentions another tradition, which seems, nevertheless, never to have obtained extensive currency:—"Mark is said (λέγεται) to have composed his Gospel *in Egypt* at the solicitation of the disci-

[1] Page lxv.

ples there." Modern critics in general, inclusive of Ewald, Köstlin, Hilgenfeld, acquiesce in the common opinion of the ancients. Some of them suppose that we have in the considerable list of Latinisms that is found in the Gospel,[1] internal evidence in favour of the tradition.

Not much weight should be attached to the occurrence of the Latinisms, for they are found also in Matthew and Luke. There was naturally a considerable sifting-in of Latin words and phrases over the whole extent of the Roman empire. They abound, as Volkmar remarks,[2] in the Talmud; and yet no one would conclude from that fact, that it was written in Rome.

Another plea has been put in for Rome. Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, chapter xvi, 13, says, "Salute *Rufus*, chosen in the Lord, and his mother and mine." This Rufus was evidently a somewhat conspicuous disciple, dwelling or sojourning in Rome. And it is quite natural to suppose that he may have been the brother of Alexander, and the son of Simon. If so, he would be well known in the Christian circles in Rome; and hence it might be natural for Mark, if writing there, to particularize his brother and him. But on the other hand it is reasonable to suppose that the Cyrenian family would be marked and well-known over the whole extent of the Christian brotherhood, if, as is probable, the entire household traced their conversion to the father's intimate conjunction with the Saviour, when impressed to bear the cross. (See *Commentary on Chapter xv, 21.)*

In the colophons of several of the cursive manuscripts it is said that the Gospel was written *at Rome.* In some it is said that it was written *in Latin* (*ῥωμαϊστί*) *at Rome.* The colophon of the Syriac Peshito version runs, correspondingly, thus:—"Here ends the Holy Gospel, the Announcement of Mark, which he spoke and preached at Rome in the Roman language." In the Philoxenian version the postscript is to the same effect, only briefer,—"Here ends the Holy Gospel of Mark, which he spoke in the Roman language in Rome." These colophons, however, are of no authority. They merely mirror the opinion which was prevalent around the transcriber of the volume, or which was entertained by himself.

Yet Cardinal Baronius, assuming that the Gospel was published at Rome, and thinking it natural that a writing, which was intended for

---

[1] Such as *κεντυρίων (centurio), ξέστης (sextarius), σπεκουλάτωρ (speculator), τὸ ἱκανὸν ποιεῖν (satisfacere).*

[2] *Marcus und die Synopsis,* p. 646.

the use of the Romans, should be in their own language, strenuously contended, in his *Ecclesiastical Annals*,[1] that the colophons to which we have referred, represent the true state of the case.[2] The idea was welcome to him as a controvertist, in the interest of the Vulgate Version of the New Testament, as against the Greek Original. It got connected, too, with a report that the Latin Autograph of the Evangelist was actually preserved in the library of St. Mark in Venice. This report, however, was a fabrication 'for the nonce,' or a mere superstition of ignorant monks. And the whole of the ingenious reasoning of the cardinal dissolves, when it is remembered, (1), that Paul's *Epistle to the Romans* is in Greek; (2), that the Jews everywhere, and consequently the Jewish Christians, were more familiar with Greek than with Latin; and (3), that Mark's Gospel, though doubtless intended for diffusion among the Gentiles, would be, in the first instance, handed over to the Christian Jews, and those Greek-speaking Gentiles who were associated with them in ecclesiastical communion. Father Simon did himself credit, as a critic, when he boldly assailed the cardinal's conceit, as utterly irreconcilable at once with the unanimous convictions of the fathers, and with the literary principles on which the apostles and their coadjutors conducted their New Testament enterprise.

It is needless to make specific reference to the crowd of critical 'repetents,' who, for a series of years, echoed the cardinal's conceit. Neither is it needful to discuss a corresponding conceit of Wahl's, that the Gospel was originally composed in Coptic, and thence translated into Greek.[3] It is true, however, that the patriarch of the Coptic church regards himself as the true successor of Mark, and sitting in his cathedra.

## §. 11. The Plan, Aim, and Style of the Gospel.

The "Gospel according to Mark" does not claim to be *a Scientific History*. It does not aim at tracing the processes of social evolution

---

[1] An. 45, n. 37 ff.

[2] "His igitur prope necessariis rationibus non solum suademur, sed obstricti "ferme devincimur atque plane cogimur affirmare, Evangelium Marci ab eo "Latine potius quam Græce esse conscriptum."—*n.* 41.

[3] Wahl's *Magazin für alte, besonders biblische und orientalische Literatur*, 3te Lieferung, pp. 8 ff.

around the Saviour of mankind, or at manipulating the fully-linked concatenation of causes and effects, which permeated the specific moral condition of the Jews, eighteen hundred and fifty years ago. To view the Gospel under this aspect, or to demand from it the conditions of such a species of literary composition, would be doing it very great injustice. It would, among other fatal consequences, be exciting illegitimate expectations, which would necessarily issue in illegitimate disappointment.

Neither is the Gospel a little *Compilation of Christian Annals*, something like the embryo, or first instalment, of the *Ecclesiastical Annals* of Cardinal Baronius. It would be doing it, as we have already remarked, in a previous Section,[1] a very great injustice to exact of it, or to expect from it, the strict chronological sequences of *Annals*. There is, to be sure, a certain obvious outline of genuine chronology forming the substantial framework of the narrative. That was indispensable. It was inevitable. Our Lord's public career, like every other career, lay along a given chronological path. It had a beginning, middle, and ending. It was a growth. But the interest and value, that attach to it, did not depend on any of the minute items of chronology. And thus there is no attempt, on the part of the Evangelist, to work these items into a scientifically jointed adjustment.

His Gospel is not even *an elaborated or scientifically constructed Biography*. It is, of course, biographical. But there is no evidence of an intention to furnish "a full and particular account" of the career and character of our Lord. There is no attempted analysis of the elements of his idiosyncrasy. It is entirely wilful on the part of any critic or reader to assume that Mark, or any other of the Evangelists, should have given us such an analysis, and thence to conclude that it is an imperfection that he does not attempt it. It is wilful, likewise, to assume that he recorded all the incidents, discourses, and sayings of which he had reliable information. It is wilful to assume that the diversities in the respective Gospels are to be accounted for on the principle that the respective Evangelists emptied out as it were, and exhausted, their respective measures of personal knowledge or secondary information. (Compare John xxi, 25.) To follow out any of these lines of assumption leads far astray from the all-important practical standpoints of observation, which should be occupied by readers in general and by critics in particular.

---

[1] Pages xxxiii, xxxiv.

The Evangelist's literary task, though in one respect, almost the sublimest imaginable, was, in another, nearly the simplest conceivable. It was to give, for practical and spiritual purposes, free and easy *Memoirs*, or *Memorabilia*, or *Memorials of our Lord*.

His Gospel, in truth, is *a Gospel*, just because it is *gospel*, and *the gospel*, not *history proper*, or *annals proper*, or *a regular and chronicle biography*. Dr. Bernhard Weiss lays down, as a principle, that "the last motive of the Evangelist's writing was not biographical but didactic." It is emphatically true. The Evangelist meant his narrative to be *a simple biographical representation of the gospel*. It is, that is to say, and was meant to be, a simple mirroring or photographing of him, who is, in his own living personality, the sum, substance, and subject of the gospel. The mirroring or photographing is partial indeed. That was inevitable. But it is real. And it is sufficient: for the grand object mirrored was and is, in all the phases of his peculiar character and career, the Living Gospel. He is, as it were, the Gospel alive. In his life, with all its effluents of work and word, and all its influent of opposition and suffering, the gospel lives, and moves, and has its being. It must be so. His life incarnates all love: and his love was really that divine, world-wielding love, which, when manifested, *and as manifested*, is the very essence of gospel to the erring children of men, (John iii, 16). This essence of gospel is the 'open secret' of all the Gospels. And, just as the individuals, whether professional or lay, who, in these modern times, appreciate and promulgate the gospel, often vary from one another in their presentations, and frequently indeed from themselves when they have occasion to write more treatises than one, or to deliver more addresses than one, on the subject,—now omitting what they formerly admitted, and now admitting what they formerly omitted,—now employing one "form of sound words," and now making use of another; so the original Evangelists differed from one another, more or less, in their respective presentations. And if each had written a second time, we need not doubt that he would have introduced still farther variations.

Consider, for instance, the varieties of rendering on the part of our English translators of the Bible, even when the original words are identical. Take an example from the respective versions of—

---

[1] *Das Marcusevangelium und seine synoptischen Parallelen*, Einleitung, § 5, p. 23.

| Mark xii, 38, 39. | Luke xx, 46. |
| --- | --- |
| "which *love to go* in *long clothing*, and love *salutations* in the *market-places*, and the *chief seats* in the synagogues, and the *uppermost rooms* at feasts." | "which *desire to walk* in *long robes*, and love *greetings* in the *markets*, and the *highest seats* in the synagogues, and the *chief rooms* at feasts."[1] |

The words which we have italicised, are identical in the original.

Consider, moreover, the rich varieties in the presentation of the gospel throughout the whole "volume of the Book."

It is not in the least unnatural, therefore, that Mark, when intending to give a biographical presentation of the gospel, freely ran off its precious ore, so far as form was concerned, into his own peculiar cast of some of the moulds that were in common use among the apostles and their coadjutors. He might, no doubt, have used other casts, slightly different in details. But as there was a necessity for individualising, he made his selection, we may believe, so far as the factor of his own agency was concerned, freely, easily, perhaps instinctively, and certainly without taking into account the elements which would have been of moment if there had been any definite aim in the direction of scientific adjustment, or literary purity and elegance.

This brings us to the *style* of the Evangelist. It is exceedingly unclassical, strongly provincial, and destitute of every species of "the wisdom of words." It is homely, humble, unadorned, and altogether devoid of literary artifice or art. This artlessness is partly a charm, and partly a source of hermeneutical difficulty. See, as outstanding specimens of it, chapters i, 2, 4, 9, 39; ii, 1, 15, 18, 21, 23; iii, 8, 16; iv, 25, 27, 31; v, 14, 19, 30, 35; vi, 8, 9, 11, 14, 16, 17, 43, 56; vii, 1, 2, 3; viii, 16, 19, 24; ix, 13; x, 10; xi, 1; xii, 11, 23, 34; xiii, 34, 35; xiv, 9, 49, 50; xv, 24; xvi, 4; &c. See, moreover, the "vexed expressions" in chapters vii, 3; viii, 26; ix, 13, 23; xiv, 41, 72; xvi, 13.

Like most other writers, whether inartificial or cultured, Mark has his favourite phrases, or mannerisms of expression. He deals very largely indeed—after the fashion of the true Hebrew—with the conjunction *and*, but is sparing in the use of *for*. (See Tischendorf on chap. xiii, 6.) When introducing a new topic of discourse, or something that was said *furthermore*, he frequently uses the expression

[1] Townson makes use of these verses in his *Discourses on the Four Gospels*. Works, vol. i, p. 62.

*and he said to them.* (See chapters iv, 9, 13, 24, 26, 30, 40; vi, 10; vii, 9, &c.) He has, too, a partiality for fixing attention on *beginnings*, —employing, in a manneristic way, the phrase *began.* (See chapters i, 45; iv 1; v, 17, 20; vi, 2, 7, 34, 55; viii, 31, 32; x, 28, 32, 41, 47; xi, 15; xii, 1; xiii, 5; xiv, 19, 33, 65, 69, 71; xv, 8, 18.) But the most remarkable of all his favourite expressions, is the word *immediately*, which, however, as employed by him, means in general nothing more than *without loss of time.* It occurs with extreme frequency, nearly as often as in all the other writings of the New Testament put together.

## §. 12. Integrity of Mark's Gospel.

It is, as we have elsewhere remarked,[1] one of Ewald's opinions that the Canonical Gospel according to Mark has, relatively to his Original Gospel, been impoverished by omissions, as well as enriched by interpolations. It has both lost and gained.

Such an opinion, however, is a mere conjecture, unnecessary, arbitrary, and improbable. It would be superfluous to enter into a detailed criticism of it, after the full discussions in Section 8.

Along with many other critics, and notably with Eusebius in ancient times, and Griesbach, Fritzsche, Scholz, Credner, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Michelsen, Scholten, Volkmar, Weiss, in modern times, Ewald regards the last twelve verses of the last chapter of the Gospel as "a later addition." This notion has grown into a romance of criticism, which has thrown a spell of doubt over spirits that have not the least sympathy with biblical scepticism. But we have shown, in a full discussion of the subject, in the body of the *Commentary*, that the romance has culminated. There is really not the shadow of a good reason for questioning the authenticity of the passage. See pp. 467—470, 484—492.

## §. 13. The Topical Position of Mark's Gospel in the Group of Gospels.

Clemens of Alexandria mentions a tradition which he had received from certain "elders" regarding the chronological order of the

[1] See page xlviii.

Gospels. *Those were written first*, it was said, *which contain the genealogies*.[1]

According to this tradition Luke's Gospel should have stood before Mark's in "the volume of the Book." And so it actually does in the ancient manuscript that belonged to Beza (*codex Bezæ*), and which is now one of the 'lions' of the University Library of Cambridge. The order of the Gospels in the manuscript is "Matthew, John, Luke, Mark." And hence this is the order that is followed in *Whiston's Revision of the English New Testament.*

If the topical arranging of the Gospels had been committed to Macknight, Dunster, or Büsching, they would have put Luke first, and then, in succession, Matthew, Mark, and John. If Beza had got his will, he would, while keeping Matthew before John, have put Luke before Mark,[2] just as Owen and Griesbach, with all their followers, would have done.

The adherents, again, of the 'Mark-hypothesis,'—such as Wilke, Weisse, Ewald, Holtzmann, Weiss,—think that Mark should lead the chorus of Evangelists, as being the earliest of them all, and the fontal source of the Gospels of both Matthew and Luke.

It would appear that the ancients in general regarded the present order as representing the chronological succession of the Gospels. It may be so in fact. Not unlikely it is so. But it is not proved. And it will be no great calamity to the interests of Christianity in particular, or of 'pure and undefiled religion' in general, although the true chronological order of these primitive Evangelical Records should remain for ever undetermined and indeterminable.

## §. 14. The Contents of the Gospel.

The Contents of the Gospel may be tabulated as follows:—


| | Chaps. and Vs. |
|---|---|
| I. The Preliminaries of the public career of Jesus, . . | i, 1—13 |
| 1. The forerunnership of John the Baptist, . . . . . | i, 1—8 |
| 2. The baptism of Jesus, . . . . . | i, 8—11 |
| 3. His temptation, . . . . . | i, 12, 13 |
| II. The public career of Jesus in Galilee and its neighbourhood, . . . . . | i, 14—ix, 50 |


[1] Preserved in Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History*, vi, 14.

[2] *Procemium in Marcum.*

CHAPS. AND VS.

1. He begins to preach, . . . . . i, 14, 15
2. He calls four fishermen to become his disciples and attendants, . . . . . i, 16—20
3. He teaches, and delivers a demoniac, in the Synagogue at Capernaum, . . . . . i, 21—26
4. The people were amazed at his words and work; and he becomes instantly famous, . . . . . i, 27, 28
5. He heals Peter's mother-in-law, who was sick of a fever, . . . . . i, 29—31
6. Many other sick persons, as also demoniacs, are brought to him, and he heals them, . . . . . i, 32—34
7. In the morning he retires to a solitary place for prayer; but Peter and his friends go in quest of him, . . . . i, 35, 36
8. He visits with his disciples various towns, preaches, and casts out demons, . . . . . i, 37—39
9. He heals a leper, who blazes the matter abroad, so that crowds from all quarters flock to him, . . . . i, 40—45
10. In Capernaum a paralytic is brought to him, to whom he says, *Son, thy sins be forgiven thee*, . . . . . ii, 1—5
11. The scribes that were present were scandalized, and thought that he was guilty of blasphemy, . . . . . ii, 6, 7
12. Jesus proved his right to speak as he had done, by healing the paralytic, . . . . . ii, 8—12
13. He calls Levi to be one of his attendant-disciples, . . ii, 13, 14
14. In Levi's house he sits at meat with "publicans and sinners," and defends his conduct against the carping of the scribes and Pharisees, . . . . . ii, 15—17
15. He answers complaints of the disciples of John and of the Pharisees in reference to fasting, . . . . . ii, 18—22
16. His disciples are charged with desecration of the Sabbath, and he defends them, . . . . . ii, 23—28
17. He revitalized a withered hand on the sabbath day and defends the act, . . . . . iii, 1—5
18. The Pharisees and Herodians have their malignity stirred, and plot his destruction, . . . . . iii, 6
19. Jesus withdrew to the shore of the sea of Galilee, but was followed by numerous crowds from far and near, many of whose sick he healed, . . . . . iii, 7—12
20. He chooses twelve, whom he might send forth, as apostles, to assist him in preaching and teaching, . iii, 13—19
21. He is still, however, tasked to the uttermost to minister to the crowds who press in upon him, . . . . iii, 20
22. His relatives begin to think that he is "beside himself," . . iii, 21
23. Scribes are sent down from Jerusalem to act as inquisitors, and they allege that he did his wonderful works by the aid of Beelzebul, . . . . . iii, 22
24. Jesus refutes their cruel blasphemy of his character, and solemnly warns them, . . . . . iii, 23—30

CHAPS. AND VS.

25. In reference to his relatives who were busying themselves intermeddlingly, he declares who are his truest relatives, . . . . . iii, 31—35
26. He began to teach in vivid parables, . . . . . iv, 1, 2
27. The parable of the sower, . . . . . iv, 3—20
28. A cluster of other striking sayings, . . . . . iv, 21—25
29. More vivid parables, . . . . . iv, 26—34
30. He passes over toward the eastern side of the lake; and, overcome with fatigue, sleeps during the passage. A storm arises, which, when he is waked up, he stills, . . . . . iv, 35—41
31. On the eastern side of the lake he relieves a demoniac who called himself Legion. The demons are allowed to enter a herd of swine, which go mad and are drowned in the lake, . . . . . v, 1—13
32. The inhabitants get alarmed, and entreat him to leave their district. But the cured demoniac goes forth and proclaims the miracle round and round, . . . . . v, 14—20
33. Jesus returns to the west coast of the lake and restored to life the deceased daughter of Jairus. On the way, a woman is healed of hemorrhage by touching his garment, . . . . . v, 21—43
34. He visits Nazareth, where he spent his youth, but is received coldly and incredulously, . . . . . vi, 1—5
35. He marvelled at their unbelief, and went elsewhere teaching, . . . . . vi, 6
36. He sent forth his twelve attendant-disciples to preach and heal, . . . . . vi, 7—13
37. The tetrarch Herod hears of him, and thinks that he is John the Baptist returned from the world of the disembodied, . . . . . vi, 14
38. Others had different opinions regarding him, but Herod stood to his own notion, for he was ill at ease for having murdered John, . . . . . vi, 15, 16
39. The story of the murder of John, . . . . . vi, 17—29
40. The apostles return to Jesus, and report progress, and they all go to get retirement and rest for a season. They go by boat to the other side of the lake, . . vi, 30—32
41. They were watched, however, by multitudes who hasted by land to get near the wonderful Rabbi. He had compassion on them, and taught them, . . vi, 33, 34
42. He fed about five thousand in an uninhabited place on five loaves and two fishes, . . . . . vi, 35—44
43. Having spent a great part of the evening in prayer, he walked on the sea to his disciples, who were toiling at their oars in a storm, . . . . . vi, 45—52
44. When they landed on the coast of Gennesaret, he was pressed by multitudes, who were eager to get their

CHAPS. AND VS.

sick ones healed, and "as many as touched him were made whole," . . . . . vi, 53—56

45. The Pharisees and scribes find fault with him for allowing his disciples to eat with unbaptized hands. He defends his disciples, and exposes the wretched outwardliness of the religious manners of their accusers, . . . . . vii, 1—13

46. He teaches the people in general, and his disciples in particular, the inwardliness of true religion, . . . vii, 14—23

47. He makes a detour into the neighbourhood of Tyre and Sidon, and heals, at a distance, the daughter of a Syrophœnician woman, . . . . . vii, 24—30

48. He returned to Galilee by the way of Decapolis, on the north-east, and restores his hearing and speech to a deaf and dumb man, . . . . . vii, 31—37

49. A second time he feeds miraculously in the desert a great multitude, about four thousand, . . . . . viii, 1—9

50. He goes to Dalmanutha, and is asked by the Pharisees to prove what he was by some great "sign from the sky." He declines to pander to their frivolous, sceptical, and curiosity-hunting spirit, . . . . . viii, 10—13

51. While crossing the lake with his disciples, he speaks to them of the leaven of the Pharisees and of Herod, but they have difficulty in understanding him, . . viii, 14—21

52. At Bethsaida he gives sight to a blind man, . . . viii, 22—26

53. In going toward Cæsarea Philippi, he interrogates his disciples regarding the conflicting opinions that were floating about in the public in reference to him. When he asks them for their own judgement on the matter, Peter says "Thou art the Christ," . . . viii, 27—30

54. He begins to predict his rejection by men, his ignominious death, and his glorious resurrection, . . . . . viii, 31

55. Peter, fixing his mind on the announcement of his Lord's ignominious death, "began to rebuke him," and Jesus had to reprove him sharply, . . . . . viii, 32, 33

56. He announces the necessity of cross-bearing as a condition of discipleship, . . . . . viii, 34—38—ix, 1

57. Jesus is transfigured in presence of Peter, James, and John, . . . . . ix, 2—8

58. He charged the three favoured disciples to tell no man what they had witnessed, till after his resurrection: and they wonder what he means by his resurrection, . ix, 9, 10

59. They have a difficulty about Malachi's prophecy regarding Elijah; and Jesus explains what was meant, . ix, 11—13

60. He heals, at the foot of the mount of transfiguration, a poor demoniac lad, . . . . . ix, 14—29

61. He seeks to pass incognito through Galilee; and speaks to his disciples again regarding his coming

CHAPS. AND VS.

death and consequent resurrection. But they did not understand him, . . . . . ix, 30—32

62. In Capernaum he rebuked his disciples for their self-seeking eagerness to get honours in the kingdom of which he was to be king, and he bids them be childlike, . . . . . ix, 33—37

63. A cluster of remarkable instructions and sayings, . . ix, 38—50

III. THE CAREER OF JESUS ON HIS WAY FROM GALILEE TO JUDEA, AND THENCEFORWARD TILL HIS DECEASE IN JERUSALEM, . . . . . x—xv

1. Jesus goes toward Judea by the eastern side of Jordan, . . x, 1
2. On the way, Pharisees propose to him, temptingly, a question concerning divorce, . . . . . x, 2—12
3. His heart yearns over certain little children, who were brought to him, . . . . . x, 13—16
4. He deals faithfully with a rich young man, who asked, *What shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?* . . . x, 17—22
5. He speaks of the difficulty of being both rich and good, . x, 23—27
6. He speaks of the reward of those who make sacrifices for his sake and for the sake of the Gospel, . . . . x, 28—31
7. He again makes known to his disciples his approaching sufferings and death, and his consequent resurrection, . x, 32—34
8. James and John, the sons of Zebedee, prefer an unwise and selfish request, and are faithfully dealt with, . . x, 35—40
9. When the rest of the disciples knew what James and John had been asking, they were incensed ; but Jesus unfolded the true glory of man, the glory of ministering and giving, . . . . . x, 41—45
10. The company reaches Jericho, where Jesus restores sight to Bartimæus, a blind beggar, . . . . . x, 46—52
11. The company reach Bethany, and two disciples are despatched to Bethphage to obtain a colt, . . . . . xi, 1—6
12. The colt is brought, and Jesus, riding on it, enters Jerusalem triumphally, . . . . . xi, 7—11
13. He returns in the evening to Bethany, . . . . . xi, 11
14. Coming in next day to Jerusalem, he sought figs on a leafy fig-tree. Finding none, he invokes a blight on the tree, . . . . . xi, 12—14
15. He enters the temple and purifies it, . . . . . xi, 15—17
16. The scribes and chief priests were intensely offended, and plotted "how they might destroy him," . . . . . xi, 18
17. In the evening he left the city ; and next morning the disciples saw that the fig-tree had withered. Jesus took occasion to impress them with the power of faith and prayer, . . . . . xi, 19—24
18. A forgiving spirit must be joined with prayer, . . . xi, 25, 26
19. When he was in the temple, the chief priests, scribes,

CHAPS. AND VS.

and elders come and demand his authorization for acting as he did, . . . . . xi, 27, 28

20. Jesus asked them a preliminary question, which they would not answer. He therefore declined to answer the question which they had put to him, . . . . xi, 29—33

21. He spoke to them, and the people, a parable,—*the parable of the iniquitous vineyard-tenants*, . . . . . xii, 1—11

22. The authorities were enraged, and sought to arrest him, but feared the people, . . . . . xii, 12

23. They then sent Pharisees and Herodians to get him entrapped politically, if possible, in his words, but he saw through the manœuvre and confounded his interrogators, . . . . . xii, 13—17

24. Some Sadducees then tried to overthrow him in argument: but they too were utterly foiled and nonplussed, . . . . . xii, 18—27

25. A scribe asked him which is the first commandment of all; and was delighted with the answer, . . . . xii, 28—34

26. None dared to interrogate him any more, . . . . . xii, 34

27. Jesus exposed the shallowness of the scribes' teaching regarding the Messiah, . . . . . xii, 35—37

28. He denounced the scribes, . . . . . xii, 38—40

29. He noted the great liberality of a poor widow in giving two mites, . . . . . xii, 41—44

30. Sitting on the Mount of Olives with his disciples he reveals some of the great scenes of the future, both nearer and more remote, . . . . . xiii, 1—37

31. The chief priests and scribes plotted to get him arrested "by craft;" but wished to postpone the execution of their plot till after the passover, . . . xiv, 1, 2

32. Jesus, at an entertainment in Bethany, is anointed by a woman, . . . . . xiv, 3

33. Some were offended at the "waste of the ointment," especially Judas, . . . . . xiv, 4—10

34. When Jesus had vindicated the woman and rebuked the grumblers, Judas went to the chief priests to betray him, . . . . . xiv, 11—12

35. Jesus observed the passover with his disciples; made touching reference to the treason of the traitor; and instituted the New Testament Passover-supper, . . xiv, 13—25

36. He goes with the eleven to the Mount of Olives, and intimates to them that they would all that very night be stumbled in reference to him, . . . . . xiv, 26—28

37. Peter expressed his confidence that *he* at least would not be stumbled. Jesus tells him that before the cock crowed twice he would be guilty of a triple denial, . . . . . xiv, 29, 30

38. The agony in Gethsemane, . . . . . xiv, 31—42

CHAPS. AND VS.

39. The traitor comes with his company, and Jesus allowed himself to be arrested, . . . . . xiv, 43—49
40. His disciples all forsake him and flee, . . . . . xiv, 50
41. A young man is aroused out of bed as the noisy company pass along, and he follows Jesus, . . . . . xiv, 51
42. Jesus is taken to the high priest's house to be examined, . xiv, 53
43. Peter follows afar off, and gets into the court of the house, . . . . . xiv, 54
44. Jesus is accused, but could not be convicted. In answer to the High Priest's adjuration, he confessed that he was "the Christ, the Son of the Blessed," . xiv, 55—63
45. He is condemned to be worthy of death, . . . . . xiv, 64
46. He is shamefully maltreated by the officials who were around, . . . . . xiv, 65
47. Peter thrice denies his Lord, . . . . . xiv, 66—72
48. In the morning the Sanhedrim, after a hurried meeting, delivers Jesus over to Pilate the Roman Procurator, as one who was worthy of death, . . . . xv, 1
49. Pilate saw no evidence of criminality, and wished to release him; but the chief priests moved the people to ask Barabbas instead, and to demand that Jesus should be crucified in place of Barabbas, . . . . . xv, 2—14
50. Pilate yielded; and his soldiery cruelly mocked the innocent prisoner, . . . . . xv, 15—19
51. He is led off to be crucified, and Simon of Cyrene is impressed to assist in carrying the cross, . . . . xv, 20, 21
52. He is crucified on Golgotha between two robbers, . xv, 22—28
53. The passers-by mocked him as he hung on the cross, and even the chief priests came out to gloat over his agonies, . . . . . xv, 29—32
54. It is darkness from the sixth to the ninth hour; and at the ninth hour Jesus, after uttering significant exclamations, expires, . . . . . xv, 33—37
55. The veil of the temple was rent, . . . . . xv, 38
56. The Roman centurion was awed, and felt convinced that the Crucified One was "God's Son," . . . . . xv, 39
57. The holy women were looking on afar off, . . . . . xv, 40, 41
58. Joseph of Arimathea craves the body from Pilate, obtains it, and interred it in a sepulchre, to the door of which a stone was rolled, . . . . . xv, 42—46
59. Two of the holy women behold where he was laid, . . . xv, 47

IV. THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS ON THE THIRD DAY AFTER HIS DECEASE.

1. After the Sabbath, some of the women come to the sepulchre very early in the morning, . . . . . xvi, 1, 2
2. They are concerned about the great stone; but when they look, lo it is rolled away, . . . . . xvi, 3, 4

CHAPS. AND VS.

3. Entering the sepulchre an angel informs them that Jesus is risen. He also tells them to say to "the disciples *and Peter*" that their Lord would meet them in Galilee, . . . . . xvi, 5—7
4. The women run to fulfil their errand, . . . . . xvi, 8
5. Jesus appeared first to Mary of Magdala, . . . . . xvi, 9—11
6. He then appeared to two of the disciples going into the country, . . . . . xvi, 12, 13
7. Afterward, he appeared to the eleven as they sat at meat, . . . . . xvi, 14
8. He gives the eleven their evangelical commission, . xvi, 15—18
9. He ascends to heaven, . . . . . xvi, 19
10. His apostles were faithful to their commission, and were blessed in their work of faith and labour of love, . xvi, 20

GLASGOW:
PRINTED BY ALEX. MACDOUGALL.

# THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MARK.

## CHAPTER I.

*Beginning of the good news about Jesus Christ.—John the Baptist, and his preparatory ministry,* 1—8. *Jesus is baptized by him,* 9. *After his baptism, the heavens are opened, and he receives the fulness of the Spirit,* 10. *The Father bears testimony to him,* 11. *He is then tempted in the wilderness,* 12, 13. *He begins to preach in Galilee,* 14, 15. *He calls Simon and Andrew, James and John,* 16—20. *He teaches in Capernaum, in the synagogue, and delivers a demoniac,* 21—26. *The people are amazed, and his fame takes wing,* 27, 28. *He heals Simon's mother-in-law, and many others in Capernaum,* 29—34. *He retires to pray, and is followed by Simon and others,* 35—37. *He visits other towns of Galilee, and preaches,* 38, 39. *He heals a leper, who blazes abroad the cure,* 40—45.

## CHAPTER I.

Ver. 1. *The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ*:—Or rather without the article, *Beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.* The absence of the article shows that the expression is a kind of *Title.* Some have thought, indeed, that the evangelist intended it to be the Title of his entire work. Erasmus for instance, and Alexander; and also Klostermann. But on that hypothesis the word *Beginning* seems awkward. Alexander would interpret the word locally, as if the meaning were, *This is the beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ,* or, *Here begins the Gospel of Jesus Christ.* Klostermann goes deeper, and interprets the word temporally, supposing that it has a reference to the incipient stage of the career of the everlasting Gospel. All the events of the public life of Christ were, according to his idea, but *the beginning of the Gospel.* The contents of the immediately succeeding verses, however, show us that the evangelist was thinking of events that were preliminary to the events of the public life of Christ. He is going back, in his retrospect, to the dispensation of the Saviour's forerunner; and, in the events of that dispensation he finds the *Beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.* Of course he might have gone farther back still, and found other fountains, the feeders of the fountain at which he pauses. Or he might have continued to ascend till he reached the absolute Beginning, the Fountain of fountains. His purpose, however, was

THE beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of

---

served by taking up his position beside the things that were the immediate antecedents of the public career of our Lord. When he calls these things the *Beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ*, he was not so much thinking, as Petter and Bengel properly remark, of a Title for his book, or even of a Heading for its initial section, as of the actual commencement in time of the things themselves, which he proceeds to specify. As his thoughts, however, and the words which were their vestures, were to him the mere subjective mirrorings of the objective historical realities, on which his gaze was fixed, they became as he detained them in the presence of his consciousness, *a kind of indistinct Title*,—the expression *the Gospel of Jesus Christ* referring to the events of the life of the Saviour, as these are about to be narrated in the body of the following Memoirs, and the word *Beginning* referring to the introductory events of the career of John the Baptist, as represented in the few initial sentences which commence with verse 4, and merge and melt into the greater history at verses 9—11. It would be assuming an exceedingly unnatural involution were we, with Lachmann, to throw verses 2 and 3 into a parenthesis, and to connect verses 1 and 4 in such a manner that verse 1 supplied the nominative to the verb in verse 4,—*(The) beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, God's Son, was John baptizing in the wilderness, &c.*———The genitive expression *of Jesus Christ* is, as grammarians phrase it, *the genitive of the object*, not *the genitive of the subject*,—thus making the meaning of the whole expression to be *the good news concerning Jesus Christ*, not *the good news proclaimed by Jesus Christ*. It is true that Jesus Christ did proclaim his own gospel; but he is here represented as the Sum and Substance of the Gospel, which both he and his apostles proclaimed. Grotius, however, among the older expositors, and Ewald among the more modern, interpret the genitive subjectively. Unnaturally. See Rom. i, 1—3, 9, 16.———*Jesus Christ*:–The finely significant proper name of our Lord. He was called *Jesus*, because he was *a Saviour*. (See Matt. i, 21.) He was called *Christ* or *Messiah* because he filled the office of Saviourhood by sovereign appointment. The Divine Father appointed him, and hence, as it were, *anointed* him. The word *Christ* is Greek; the word *Messiah* is Hebrew: and both of the terms mean *Anointed*. There was poured out on our Lord, anointingly, by the hand of the Father, all that was needed to fit him to be a Saviour. Great officers in church and state, among the Jews, and Kings emphatically, were installed in their offices by anointing. Jesus, as the King of kings, had his anointing. ———*The Son of God*:–Or, more literally, and as Sir John Cheke gives it, *God's Son*:—(*gloriosissimus et nobilissimus titulus*,–Zwingli). Our Lord, in his life on earth, had claimed to be at once *the Christ* and *God's Son*. He was condemned by the Jewish Sanhedrim for insisting on the claim. (See Mark xiv, 61—64. Compare Matt. xxvi, 63—66.) His resurrection sublimely verified the legitimacy of his claim, and instamped an imperishable significancy on the double designation. Hence it was peculiarly appropriate in Mark to prefix to his Memoirs the twofold appellation. It has been doubted, however, whether the words *God's Son* were in the autograph-text of the evangelist. Tischendorf has omitted them in his 8th edition. Schenkel assumes that the omission

God; 2 as it is written in the prophets, "Behold, [a] Mal. 3. 1.

---

is correct. They are not found in the original Sinaitic Manuscript (ℵ*); and they are wanting in an important quotation of the passage by Irenæus (iii, 11), and in five distinct quotations of Origen. They are omitted also by other early writers. But, on the other hand, they are found in all the early versions, and, with the exception of the original Sinaitic, in all the best manuscripts. They are found, likewise, in two passages of Irenæus. And, indeed, it almost seems to us that, in the remaining passage where they are omitted, they should be found. *The preceding context seems to demand their presence.* On the whole it is probable that the words are genuine, and that their omission in the quotations of so many of the early Fathers is to be accounted for on the principle, that the Fathers, in their references, used the freedom, for brevity's sake, of dropping out of view unessential clauses. And hence, indeed, Epiphanius, in quoting the passage before us, omits even the preceding words *of Jesus Christ*, and connects at once the words of the 2d verse with the expression *Beginning of the Gospel.* (Hæres. li. 6, p. 427, ed. 1682.) We do not pause to unfold here the theological significancy of the designation, *God's Son.* As applied to our Lord, it involves the great idea, that he had in him a higher nature than man's. He was of one nature with God. Man needed a Divine Saviour.

Vers. 2. *As it has been written*: Some editors and expositors, putting a full point at the close of verse 1, regard this expression as bending anticipatively forward, and hooking itself on to verse 4. So Vater for instance, and Goschen; Elsner also, and Principal Campbell, and Alexander. Whedon, running on the same line, but running faster still, says, "the second and third verses, by a strong inversion, should come after the fourth." This is unnatural, and assumes an artificial involution of structure which is quite unlikely in such a simple writer as Mark. It is better to put, with Tischendorf (in his 8th edition of the text), a comma at the conclusion of the first verse, and thus to regard the contents of the second and third verses, as appended to the first in a free and easy manner, with the intent of showing that the events about to be narrated had thrown their shadows before them in the Old Testament Scriptures; for it is really true that the *Beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God* was *in accordance with what had been written.*———*In the prophets*:—Such is the reading of the *Received Text.* Our Authorized Translators would find it in all the editions that were lying before them. It is the reading of Erasmus's editions and of Stephens's, and of Beza's. It is, however, a tinkered reading, as both Erasmus and Beza were convinced; and Bengel too. The reading of the autograph of Mark was, undoubtedly, *in Isaiah the prophet.* Such is the reading of the Sinaitic Manuscript (ℵ), and the Vatican (B), and the Cambridge (D), as also of L Δ, and 33—"the queen of the cursives." It is the reading, too, of the Vulgate version, and the Older Latin, the Peshito Syriac, the Harclean Syriac, the Coptic, and the Gothic. It is the reading of the principal fathers too. It has been re-imported into the text by Griesbach, Scholz, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles. It would never have been disturbed had not some timorous students of the Gospel felt it difficult or impossible to account for the fact that, preceding the quotation from Isaiah, there is a quotation from Malachi (iii, 1). Eusebius says that the word *Isaiah* stands in the text as an erratum instead of *Malachi.*

I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy

---

(See Cramer's *Catena*, in loc.) And Porphyry, the early enemy of Christianity, cast it in the teeth of the Christians that Mark had made a mistake. (See *Jerome on Matt.* iii, 3.) Griesbach too—alas!—suspected that he had. (*Com. Crit.* in loc). Even Meyer thinks that there is a mistake, and that the evangelist's memory must have been at fault;—surely a most unlikely occurrence on the part of one, who, in that early age, and in the midst of the young fervour of admiration and love and zeal, was eager to persuade his fellow-men everywhere that Jesus was the Saviour who had been promised from of old in the writings of the prophets. Beza thinks that the evangelist had really quoted only the passage from Isaiah, and that the preliminary passage from Malachi had been subsequently intruded into the text from a marginal annotation suggested by Matthew xi, 10; *(ex albo irrepsit).* The real solution of the case is to be found, not in adhering, with Lange and Godwin, to the Received Text, but in the fact that *the passage from Malachi is strictly preliminary.* It is the mere porch-way through which we are ushered into the quotation from Isaiah. The evangelist's mind went rapidly through it, and fixed its attention on the contents of the earlier and more remarkable oracle, lying beyond. (Compare Matt. xxi, 5.)———*Behold, I send my messenger*:–It is "the Lord of hosts" who speaks. See the concluding clause of Malachi iii, 1. He is just on the eve of turning the future into the present. Hence the expression *I send*, instead of *I will send*. The imminency of the act is indicated. *My Messenger*:–My servant, to whom I say "Go," and "he goeth." It is the word that is generally translated *angel*, which word *angel* just means *messenger*. Heumann, indeed, insists on translating it *angel* in the passage before us. It is John the Baptist who is referred to. See verse 4.———*Before thy face*:–A full way of saying *Before thee*. Attention is graphically fixed upon the *countenance* or *face*, which is the index to the whole man. *Before*: The Baptist was to be the forerunner of the Lord, or his harbinger. It is noteworthy that in Malachi, the expression is not *before thy face*, or *before thee*, but *before me*. The Lord of hosts speaks 'of' Himself. When Mark, however, quotes the passage, he so modifies the form of expression that *the Lord of hosts is represented as speaking 'to' the Lord of hosts.* It was a perfectly warrantable modification, for there is a sublime sphere of things in which all things are "in common" between the Father and the Son. See Matt. xi, 10.———*Who shall prepare thy way before thee*:–It is probable that the words *before thee* were added from some marginal annotation. They are not found in the manuscripts ℵ B D K L P Π. They are wanting also in the Peshito Syriac, the Jerusalem Syriac, the Coptic, and the Æthiopic versions. They are wanting also in many manuscripts of the Old Latin version; and, what is of considerable moment, Origen expressly mentions that they are omitted by Mark. *Who shall prepare thy way*:–Or, *thy road*, so that it shall be fit for thee to travel upon. In the East few good roads are ever made; and such roads, as have been made, are generally kept in most wretched repair. Hence when a Sovereign is about to visit any part of his dominions, it is requisite that a messenger, or quartermaster, as Hofmeister has it, be sent on before to get the way made ready. Such, in things spiritual, was John's

way before thee: 3 [b]the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his

[b] Isai. 40. 3.

---

mission. Men's ways were in a wretched state. Encumbrances and stumbling-blocks lay everywhere scattered about. Mud and mire were the order of the day. It seemed impossible for any one to get along through life with unpolluted garments, or without stumbling and falling, and getting bruised and broken. The real preparation that was needed, was in *the hearts of the people.* See Malachi iv, 5, 6.

VER. 3. Now comes the prophetic passage on which the evangelist's mind had been fixed. It is found in Isaiah xl, 3.——*The voice of one crying in the wilderness*:—Or rather, *A voice of one crying in the wilderness!* That is, *I hear the voice of one calling aloud in the wilderness!* It is as if the prophet had been listening from afar. Bending forward, and hushing all noises within and around, he strains his ear to hear. At length, *Lo, a voice! a voice!* He fixes his attention. It is *a voice of one calling aloud in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord! Make his paths straight!* It is not John himself, who is called *a Voice*, as many—far too many—have imagined, inclusive even of Cajetan, Petter, de Veil, and Klostermann. Petter's remark is,—"John is said "to be a Voice, in respect of the execution of his ministerial office, which was "to speak and sound forth the doctrine of the Gospel touching Christ, and "touching salvation by him." *Of one crying*: or *calling aloud* as with a herald-cry. *In the wilderness*: Not in the great city, nor in any city, but in the wilds and prairie-pasture-grounds of the wilderness. John did not go to the people: he let the people come to him. It was different with Jesus.——*Prepare ye the Lord's way*:—John himself prepared the Lord's way (see verse 2),—by calling upon the people to prepare His way. Thus he did not do everything himself. He could not. He could not, by his single agency, prepare the hearts of the people. Even God could not—in consistency with his all-wise plan—do everything. The co-agency of the people was indispensable: and hence the Herald of the Lord called upon them to act. Self-action, indeed, would not be enough. Something from above is needed. God must begin and God must end the preparation of the heart. (Prov. xvi, 1.) But between His beginning and His ending, human spontaneity comes in. There must be response to the Lord's initiatory "knock." There must be preparation for his final enthronement in the soul. *Prepare YE the way of the Lord!*——*Make his paths straight*: The word *straight* is the opposite of *crooked*. See Luke iii, 5; and compare Acts ix, 11. Roads, that have not been properly prepared at the beginning, are generally more or less crooked. So are the ways of men, when no preparation has been made for the Great King. When John cried, *Make his paths straight!* he meant, *Have done with all your crooked ways of acting! Be straightforward with yourselves! Let there be no winding and doubling! Be honest!* The Lord will not enter into hypocritical souls.

VER. 4. *John did baptize in the wilderness*:—An exceedingly free translation, coming down to us from Tyndale. It is doubtless too free; and yet it is difficult to render, at once faithfully and idiomatically, the evangelist's somewhat rugged phraseology, (ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης (ὁ) *βαπτίζων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ*). The rendering

paths straight. 4 [c] John did baptize in the wil- [c] Mat. 3. 1. Lu. 3. 3. John 1. 6. John 3. 23.

---

will be modified, according as we reject or receive the article before the participle. If the article be rejected, we might translate thus, *There appeared John, baptizing in the wilderness*, or, more freely, *It came to pass that John appeared, baptizing in the wilderness.* But if, with Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, we receive the article, then we might translate thus, *There appeared John, the baptizer in the wilderness*, that is, *There appeared John, who baptized in the wilderness.* The article *should* be received. It is found in the Sinaitic manuscript (ℵ), and the Vatican (B), and "the queen of the cursives" 33, as also in L and Δ. It is, in several respects, the more difficult reading, and not likely therefore to be an import. It was evidently regarded by many as complicating the evangelist's phraseology; and hence they quietly dropped it. It was left out in the editions of the text that were before our translators, and thus it happened that they gave the rendering, *John did baptize*, instead of some such rendering as *There appeared John who baptized.*—The verb, which we have rendered *there appeared*, (ἐγένετο), is peculiar. We have no word in our English language exactly corresponding to it. It can often be appropriately rendered *became.* Not so here, however; yet *came* would do, that is, *came upon the scene.* Principal Campbell and Young have *came.* (Compare Matt. xxvi, 20; xxvii, 1, 57; Mark iv, 35; vi, 2, &c.) It is very frequently translated, in our version, *came to pass.* (See Matt. vii, 28; ix, 10; Mark ii, 15, 23; iv, 4; Luke v, 1, 12, 17; vi. 1, 6, 12, &c.) It is also frequently rendered *arose*, or *there arose.* (See Matt. viii, 24; Mark iv, 37; John iii, 25; Acts vi, 1; xix, 23; xxiii, 7, 9, &c.) That rendering would do here. The word brings *outcome* into view, and here it intimates that, at a certain unspecified time, John *made his appearance*, or as it were *his 'début,'* as a great public functionary,—the harbinger and herald of the Messiah.——*Who baptized in the wilderness and preached, &c.*:-The evangelist might have said, transpositively, *There appeared in the wilderness John, who baptized and preached, &c.* Rilliet makes another kind of transposition. He translates thus, *John the Baptizer appeared in the wilderness, preaching, &c.* But then, along with Ewald, he omits, on the authority of the Vatican manuscript, the conjunction *and* which comes in before *preaching.* There is no occasion for disturbing the order of the evangelist's words; for it is true that John *baptized in the wilderness.* The wilderness referred to embraced a considerable tract of comparatively uninhabited land, stretching away eastward from Jerusalem, and northward from the Dead Sea, but coming down, all along, to the banks of the river Jordan. It was chiefly in the Jordan, as it swept along *the wilderness of Judea*, that John performed his baptisms. See Matt. iii, 1, 5, 6; Luke iii, 3. The *baptizing* is mentioned before the *preaching*, because it was the outstanding peculiarity of John's ministry. The participial form of the expression, *the baptizing*, (ὁ βαπτίζων), denotes continuity, or characteristic habit. As to the word *baptizing* or *baptized*, it is rendered somewhat ludicrously by Sir John Cheke, *was washing.* (But compare Mark vii, 4, 8; Heb. ix, 10.) The word intimates that John engaged himself *in administering to the people a purificatory rite.* He *(ritually) purified* them, in order that they might be prepared to be

derness, and [d]preach the [e]baptism of repentance [d]Acts 10. 37.
[e]Acts 13. 24. Acts 19. 4.

admitted into the approaching "kingdom of heaven." (See John iii, 23—26; Mark vii. 4, 8; Heb. ix, 9—23.) In thus ritually purifying them, he would throw or pour water upon them,—"sprinkling them with clean water." (See Joel ii, 28; Ezek. xxxvi. 25; Acts x. 44. 47; xi, 15, 16.) It was a beautiful symbolism, fitted to remind the people that the influence which truly purifies the heart is shed down from above. (See *Com.* on Matt. iii, 6.)———*In the wilderness*:—By avoiding the frequented haunts of men, John indicated his profound sense of the corruption that was pervading the institutions of human society. Pollution was rampant everywhere. Had he been a man, however, of only ordinary calibre of mind and force of character, he would have been simply lost in the wilderness. Only one here and one there would have known anything about him. But he was Elijah-like,—a man overtopping all his fellows in grandeur of character. When common people came in contact with him, they felt at once his superiority. He was a lion among men. And then too he belonged to a conspicuous family, a family of priests. So soon, therefore, as it was known that he was asserting that he had a message for his countrymen, and that he had undertaken to help them in preparing for the approach of the kingdom of heaven, the population, as it were *en masse*, flocked out to him.———*And preached*:—Or *publicly announced*, or *proclaimed (in a heraldic way)*. The *and* is part of the original text, though it is omitted in the Vatican manuscript (B), and in "the queen of the cursives" (33). It is found in all the other chief manuscripts, and in the chief versions. The word *preached* or *proclaimed* is participial in the original, and comes under the influence of the article which renders the preceding participle characteristically attributive. It thus conveys the idea of continuously repeated action or habit.———*The baptism of repentance*:—Or, very literally, without the article, *baptism of repentance*, that is *repentance-baptism*, or *penitential-baptism*. Such is Bengel's translation *(Bustaufe)*, and Count Zinzendorf's *(Bekehrungs-taufe)*. It was thus not simply and abstractly the duty of baptism, that John proclaimed. It was the duty of that peculiar kind of baptism, which, when voluntarily and intelligently received, mirrors forth, in its outward act, the incipient acceptance of that inward purification which is essential to the enjoyment of the privileges of the Messiah's kingdom. Hence John did not attribute any real purificatory virtue to his baptismal rite. (See Matt. iii, 2, 7—10). He knew that it was but the shadow of the one really efficacious baptism, which purifies and saves. (See Matt. iii, 11, 12; 1 Pet. iii, 21.) No one would know better than he, that it is "the water of life," as Justin Martyr says, which is "the only baptism that can purify the repentant," (τὸ βάπτισμα τὸ μόνον καθαρίσαι τοὺς μετανοήσαντας δυνάμενον. *Dialog. Trypho*, §. 14.) But John's baptism, nevertheless, was a beautiful figure of the true, a strikingly instructive symbol. And hence he unhesitatingly proclaimed, with heraldic cry, that it was the duty of the people to come to him, that they might receive it at his hands.—Josephus the historian makes interesting mention of John's baptism, and says, "John en- "joined upon the Jews first to cultivate virtue, and to put in practice righ- "teousness toward one another, and piety toward God, and then to come to

[1] for the [f] remission of sins. 5 [g] And there went out [1] Or *unto.*

*f* Acts 2. 38. Acts 10. 43. *g* Mat. 3. 5.

---

"his baptism, for thus only would the baptism (ἡ βάπτισις) be acceptable to "God, when it was used for purity of the body, (that is,—though in un-theo-"logical language,—*as a mere external symbol*), and not for expiation of sins, it "being the case that the soul was already purified by righteousness." (*Antiq.* xviii, 5, 2).—*Repentance*:–that is, *afterthought*, or *change of mind*, or *turning to a right state of mind*, namely, as regards things moral and spiritual. Such a turning begins in the intelligence, (the νοῦς), but prolongs itself into the feelings, and runs out into the ultimate choices of the will, and then terminates in the fixed activities and habits of the whole complex man. Repentance may thus be incipient, or progressive, or complete. It was only incipient repentance that was enjoined by John *as the prerequisite of his baptism*, and hence the *first* word of his ministry was, "Repent." (Matt. iii, 2; and compare *vv.* 5—8). And hence, too, as he looked to the end, and realized profoundly the necessity of progression and completion, he "baptized *unto* repentance." (Matt. iii, 11.) ———*For the remission of sins*:–Or, still more literally, without the article, *for remission of sins*, but not, as some give it, *for a remission of sins*. Instead of the preposition *for*, we have *unto* in the margin,—a still more literal rendering, and given in the Rheims. The meaning is, *in order to*. But, of course, we are not to suppose that either the people's repentance on the one hand, or John's baptism on the other, or any combination of the two, could be either the efficient or the meritorious cause of forgiveness. God only is the Efficient Cause. The sacrificial Lamb, who bore the sin of the world (John i, 29), and he only, is the Meritorious Cause. Repentance-baptism could be nothing else than *a kind of instrumental cause*,—paedagogically leading the mind out and up at once to the Efficient and to the concurrent Meritorious Cause. It was really in the faith, which was underlying the repentance-baptism, that the link was found, which united the soul to the Indispensable Causes.—*Remission*:–Or *forgiveness*, as the word is rendered in Mark iii, 29; Acts v, 31; xiii, 38; xxvi, 18; Ephes. i, 7; Col. i, 14. It is realized in deliverance from the penal consequences of sins, and is to be carefully distinguished from moral cleansing of the soul, which, however, is a still greater and grander blessing. (See Matt. vi, 12; xviii, 21—35; Luke xvii, 3, 4.)

VER. 5. *And there went out unto him all the country of Judæa*:–More literally still, *all the Judæan country*. The evangelist used that figure of speech, called by grammarians *metonymy*,—naming the *country*, while meaning its *inhabitants*. So we sometimes say, *London at this season is out of town*. It is the same license that is employed, when, in the dispensation of the Lord's Supper, we speak of "drinking this cup." (1 Cor. xi, 27.)———*And they of Jerusalem*:–Or rather, *and all they of Jerusalem*. More literally still, *and all the Jerusalemites*, or *hierosolymites*, as Sir John Cheke has it. The adjective *all*, which, in the Received Text, occurs in the next clause, properly belongs to this, and is so placed in the manuscripts noted ℵ B D L Δ, 33, and in the texts of Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles.—*All*:–The word is used in a free and easy, and popular, way. And yet, as Alexander remarks, "it must mean more than *many*, namely, the great bulk and body of the population."—*All the Jerusalem-*

unto him all the land of Judæa, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins. 6 And John was [h]clothed with camel's hair, and with a girdle of a skin about his

[h] Mat. 3. 4. Mat. 11. 8.

---

*ites.* Not only all Judæa in general, but also all the Jerusalemites in particular. Even they.———*And were baptized by him in the river Jordan* :-Matthew simply says "in the Jordan," (iii, 6), assuming that all his readers would know perfectly well that Jordan was a river. But Mark, having more distinctly in view, it may be, Gentile readers in general, many of whom might not be familiar with the geography of the Holy Land, says, "in the *river* Jordan." Wycliffe has it "in the *flood* of Jordan."—John would stand, perhaps, at some suitable point or angle within the margin of the river, and when the people came to him in file, he would lave them in succession. Or, they might station themselves in rows along the margin, and as he passed by inside, he would sprinkle them in detail.———*Confessing their sins*: The word rendered *confessing* (ἐξομολογούμενοι) strictly means *confessing out*, that is, *confessing openly* or *aloud*. It is not implied, therefore, that the people made private confession, auricularly, one by one, of particular sins. But when charged by John, in general terms, of unfaithfulness to their own consciences, and to the claims of their neighbours, and to God, they admitted the justice of the charge, acknowledged that they were "verily guilty" and thus standing greatly in need of being cleansed or baptized from unrighteousness. Both the Latin word *confess*, and the corresponding Greek word, bring out the idea of *two parties speaking;* and when applied, as here, to sins, it is implied, in the first place, that some one—either from around or from above or from within—charges the sinner with his sins, and that then, in the second place, the sinner consents to the charge. Thus there is a *togetherhood of speaking* in the matter, that is to say a *confession.*

Ver. 6. The Evangelist passes on to a description of some of the personal peculiarities of the Baptist. He was just a modern edition of the ancient Elijah.———*And John was clothed with camel's hair* :-It is not said, as Hofmeister remarks, *with a camel's skin*, but *with camel's hairs.* (Vestimentum non *de pelle*, sed *de pilis* camelorum.) The old sacred artists misunderstood the expression, and painted the Baptist as arrayed in a camel's skin. Indeed the Cambridge manuscript,—the manuscript (D) which Beza presented to the university,—has the word for *a skin* (δέρμην) instead of the word for *hairs.* De Dieu, too, contends that the Evangelist's expression was really meant to denote *a camel's hairs*, that is, *a camel's hairy skin.* But the reference was no doubt to a coarse kind of sackcloth manufactured out of the strongest hairs of the camel. It made a rough hairy robe; and thus John would be, like Elijah, "an hairy man." (2 Kings i, 8.) He was entirely self-denied to all luxury in dress.———*And with a girdle of skin about his loins* :-Tyndale's first translation (1526) was, *and wyth a gerdyll off a beestes skyn about hys loynes.* In his second version (1534) he left out the word *beestes*, but unhappily left standing *the indefinite article*, and hence its presence in our Authorized Version. Coverdale's version is *and with a lethron gerdell aboute his loynes.* "The *leathern girdle*," says Horatio B. Hackett, "may be seen around the body of the common labourer in the east, when

loins; and he did eat [i]locusts and [j]wild honey; [i] Lev. 11. 22.
[j] 1 Sa. 14. 25—29.

"fully dressed, almost anywhere; whereas men of wealth take special pride "in displaying a rich sash of silk or some other costly fabric." (*Illustrations of Scripture*, p. 61.) Chardin tells us that the dervishes in the east, in his time, wore great leathern girdles. (Harmer's *Observations*, vol. iv, p. 416.) They still wear them. And these dervishes, it may be noted,—at least the highest specimens of them,—most nearly resemble, in their character, and in the functions of their ministry, such men as John and Elijah. "All the "great men in the East," says Dr. Wolff, "who have been celebrated either as "poets, or historians, or lawyers, have been dervishes."—"If they did not "exist, no man would be safe in the deserts among the savages. They are the "chief people in the East who keep in the recollection of those savages that "there are ties between heaven and earth. They restrain the tyrant in his "oppression of his subjects; and are, in fact, the great benefactors of the "human race in the East. They are called *dervishes* from the word *dar*, "which is in English *door*, and *weesh* which means *hanging*; the purport "of the whole word being to *hang at the gate of God* (to be inspired by Him, "and to trust in his bounty)." "All the prophets of old were dervishes, "beyond all doubt, in their actions, in their style of speaking, and in their "dress." (*Travels and Adventures*, p. 297.)———*And did eat locusts and wild honey*:—That is, *His customary food was locusts and wild honey*,—the plainest of fare. He not only refrained from pampering "the flesh," he "kept it under" (1 Cor. ix, 27), and made it "endure hardness" (2 Tim. ii, 3) for great militant purposes.—*Locusts*:—"A kind of great fly," says Petter, "which useth to eat and devour the tops of corn, herbs, and trees." Jerome mentions that he had seen the whole land of Judea covered with them. (*Comment.* on Joel ii, 20.) "It is well known," says Horatio B. Hackett, "that the poorer class of people eat them, cooked or raw, in all the eastern countries where they are found." (*Illustrations*, p. 61.) Ludolf narrates that the Abyssinians "greedily eat them, as well to satisfy their hunger as in revenge; for," adds he, "it is a very sweet and wholesome sort of dyet." (*History of Ethiopia*, i, 13, p. 67.)———*Wild honey*:—Not *honey-dew*, as Robinson and Grimm suppose, a kind of gum that is found on the leaves of certain trees. The expression doubtless denotes real *wild honey*,—the product of wild bees. Henry Maundrell mentions that when he was passing through the wilderness of Judea, between the Dead Sea and Jericho, he "perceived a strong scent "of honey and wax, the sun being hot; and the bees," he adds, "were "very industrious about the blossoms of that salt weed which the plain "produces." (*Journey*, p. 86, ed. 1749.) Dr. Tristram says, "The innumerable "fissures and clefts of the limestone rocks, which everywhere flank the valleys, "afford in their recesses secure shelter for any number of swarms of wild bees; "and many of the Bedouin, particularly about the wilderness of Judea, obtain "their subsistence by bee-hunting, bringing into Jerusalem jars of that wild "honey on which John the Baptist fed in the wilderness." (*The Land of Israel*, p. 88.)———The asceticism of John in food and raiment has its lessons. There are persons who ought always to be ascetics. It is their only

7 and preached, saying, [k]There cometh one mightier than I after me, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose. 8 [l]I indeed

[k] Mat. 3. 11. John 1. 27. Acts 13. 25.
[l] Lu. 3. 16.

Acts 1. 5.

---

chance for freedom from grossness and moral degradation. There are times, too, when all men should put both bit and bridle on the animal within them, keeping it on scanty diet and working it hard. And all moral Reformers, who have it as their peculiar mission to expose the vices of a self-indulgent age, and to lead their fellow-men into cleaner ways and a nobler style of life, would require to be, in their own persons, unmistakeable examples of the higher types of sobriety and self-denial.

VER. 7. *And preached*:—That is, *proclaimed (like a herald).*———*Saying, He who is mightier than I is coming after me*:—It is as if he had said, *My Superior, my Suzerain*, or *my Lord Paramount, is coming after me.* Instead, however, of employing a merely generic term to designate the Prince whose herald and harbinger he was, he brings into view his superiority in might or strength. *He who is stronger than I is coming after me.* "This is the Gospel," says Zuingli, "though in epitome." The people were prone to think that John himself had immense 'power' with God, and that all would be well with them if they should only get a baptism from his hands. They had an exaggerated idea of his power. He sought to undeceive them. He was but a humble servant—a herald—a forerunner. But his Master was 'mighty.' His Master had real power with God. He could wield all influences; touch all springs; ascend all heights; descend to all depths. He was "*able* to save to the uttermost,"—to pardon the most criminal, and to purify the most unclean.———*The latchet of whose sandals I am not worthy to stoop down and undo*:—*Undo* is Wycliffe's word, and better than the apparently contradictory *unloose* of our Authorized Version. Sir John Cheke and Coverdale use the uncompounded term *loose* or *louse*. Purvey, in his revision of Wycliffe, has *unlace*. The word translated *latchet* means properly *thong;* but there is a connection between *latch*, *latchet*, *lash*, and *lace*. John alleges that there was no standard of comparison, by means of which the relative superiority of the Messiah to himself could be measured. The Messiah was his Master, and John was his herald and harbinger. Nevertheless he did not deserve the honour of that post. He did not even deserve the honour of being permitted to stoop down and undo the latchets of his Master's sandals. That was a far higher honour than any man deserved. How exceedingly high, then, must the dignity of Jesus be!

VER. 8. *I indeed have baptized you with water*:—Instead of *I have baptized*, it is *I baptized* in the original, (the aorist). The little particle rendered *indeed*, and suggestive of some antithesis, is thrown out of the text by Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford. It is not found in the manuscripts ℵ B L, 33, 69. The antithesis is complete without it, and is brought out by the nature of the case. The particle is found in the corresponding passages of Matthew (iii, 11) and Luke (iii, 16); and hence it is supposed that some ancient harmonist, or harmonists, would be tempted to transfer it to Mark.———*With water*:—A good translation, so far at least as the substance of the meaning is concerned,—

have baptized you with water: but he shall baptize you with [m]the Holy Ghost. [m] Joel 2. 28.

Acts 10. 47. Acts 11. 15, 16.

---

whatever may have been the form of the original expression. In the Received Text, the original expression is *in water*. But Tischendorf and Alford have thrown out the preposition *in*, under the sanction of the manuscripts ℵ B H Δ, 33, and others, and of the Vulgate version. If the omission be legitimate, then the evangelist's expression corresponds to Luke's (iii, 16), and is strictly translated *with water*. If, however, the reading of the Received Text should be retained, then the form of the expression corresponds to Matthew's (iii, 11), and could only be rendered *with water* when freely rendered. The preposition *in* would probably be accounted for by the original meaning of the verb *to baptize*,—this original meaning leaving its impress on the form of expression, even in cases in which the purificatory act was effected by some other mode than *mersing* or *merging*. (See *Com.* on Matt. iii, 6, 16.)———*But he shall baptize you*:–There is here no emphasis on the *you*, and it would be wrong therefore to lay weight upon the word, in determining the question of the extent of the baptism which Christ administered, and still administers. Nevertheless it is worthy of note that the Baptist did not feel himself fettered in the pronominal phraseology which he employed.———*With the Holy Spirit*:–There is a somewhat corresponding uncertainty in reference to the *with* in this clause, as there is in relation to the preceding clause. Tischendorf, indeed, in his 8th edition, inserts in this clause the preposition *in*, though he omits it in the preceding clause. Lachmann, on the other hand, doubts its genuineness here, though he does not doubt it as regards the preceding clause. Alford omits it in both the clauses, supposing that the *Received Text* has been artificially assimilated to Matthew's form of phraseology. It is omitted in the manuscripts B L, and in the Vulgate version. It is a matter of no practical moment whether it be admitted, as in Matthew, or omitted, as in Luke. If it be omitted, the expression is literally translated "*with* the Holy Spirit." If it be retained, the expression is only freely thus rendered.———*(The) Holy Spirit*:–The article is wanting in the original. It was not needed. The expression was, of itself, conventionally, sufficiently definite,—*Holy Spirit*. Our usage, however, in reference to definitizing by means of the article, does not correspond absolutely to the usage of the Greeks; and hence it is according to the spirit, though not according to the letter, of the evangelist's phraseology that we insert our *the*. When Wakefield rendered the expression *with a holy spirit*, and Godwin, similarly, *with a Divine Spirit*, they forgot that there is, in the letter of the original text, no more warrant for *a* than for *the*. The English language is richer than the Greek in the matter of articles, and if, in such a case as the one before us, *the* be objected to, much more should *a;* and the only remaining mode of representation would be the absolutely literal rendering, *Holy Spirit*.—The idea of the Baptist was not, that the Messiah would institute a more mystic style of water-baptism, or a style of water-baptism that would be instinct with a more efficacious spiritual energy, but it was that the Messiah would transcend altogether, in his purificatory operations, the sphere of the material and corporeal. He could act on spirit. He could act on spirit with Spirit.

9 And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was [n]baptized of John in Jordan. 10 [o]And straightway coming up

[n] Mat. 3. 13. Lu. 3. 21.

[o] Mat. 3. 16. John 1. 32.

---

And he would thus act. He would furnish to men the influence from above that was really needed in order to purity of heart and life. He would procure and pour out the influence of the Divine Spirit.

Ver. 9. *And it came to pass in those days*:—*Those days*, namely, when John was engaged in preaching and baptizing in the wilderness that stretched along the banks of the Jordan.———*That Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee to the Jordan, and was baptized by John*: There is a transposition in the phraseology, the expression *to the Jordan* or *into the Jordan* coming after in the original, and not going before, the verb *was baptized*. The evangelist, though having distinctly in view the Saviour's arrival at the Jordan, was yet in haste, as it were, to mention the fact of his baptism, and hence the peculiar collocation of the phraseology. It was quite in accordance with his ordinary inartificial style of composition, as exemplified for instance in verses 1—4 and verse 39. A similar transposition occurs in Matt. ii, 23, where we read "and he came and dwelt *in a city* called Nazareth." In the original it is *to a city* or *into a city*,—the idea being, that Joseph *came to a city called Nazareth and then dwelt there*. Of course, we cannot suppose that Mark meant that Jesus *was baptized into the Jordan*. This interpretation is out of the question, when we take into account that in the verse immediately preceding we have Mark's way of construing the word *baptized*. Jesus came *to the Jordan* and was baptized *in the Jordan*. His baptism was finely significant. It was a visible picture of the invisible descent into his humanity of the fulness of the Divine Spirit. He hence became full—officially—of the Holy Spirit. He received the Spirit "without measure;" so that the Divine Spirit had his hand, not only in the preparation of the body of our Lord (Luke i, 35), but also, and gloriously, in the preparation of his spirit. (Isai. xi, 2, 3; lxi, 1.) It was meet that there should be such blessed co-operation among the "fellows" of the Godhead.———*Nazareth of Galilee*:—There are still many traces of this despised little "city;" and quite a thriving modern town is springing up on the steep slope of the hill. It is thriving, says Dr. Tristram, in part, because it is "a Christian, not a Moslem place," and in part because it is "the centre for the commerce of the districts east of Jordan." (*The Land of Israel*, p. 122.) "Bare and featureless, singularly unattractive in its landscape, with scarcely "a tree to relieve the monotony of its brown and dreary hill, without ruins "or remains, without one precisely identified locality, there is yet a reality in "the associations of Nazareth, which stirs the soul of the Christian to its "very depths." "It was the nursery of One whose mission was to meet "man, and man's deepest needs, on the platform of common-place daily life. "'Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?' might naturally be asked, not "only by the proud Jew of the South, but by the dweller among the hills of "Galilee, or by the fair lake of Gennesaret." (*The Land of Israel*, p. 123.)

Ver. 10. *And straightway*:—Or, *immediately*—the still more frequent rendering of the word. Thiess supposes that there is a special emphasis in the

out of the water, he saw the heavens [2]opened, and the [p]Spirit like a dove descending upon him: 11 and there came a voice from heaven, *saying,*

[2] Or, *cloven, or, rent.*
[p] Isai. 11. 2. Isai. 42. 1.

---

term, as if it were intended to indicate that there was, on the part of the Saviour, a certain hastiness of movement. "The baptism," says he, "was "for him no baptism. He needed it not. It was only the people and the "Baptist who needed it. The people needed the example. John needed the "honour." It was befitting, therefore, in the Saviour to be peculiarly quick *(schneller als schnell)* in leaving the scene of the ordinance. Thiess misunderstands the case, however. It is not hastiness that is indicated, but uninterrupted sequence. Wycliffe's translation is *anoon*, (that is, *anon*).——*Coming up out of the water*:—Or rather, *going up out of the water*, that is, going up to the bank of the river. (Compare Matt. iii, 16.) Our Saviour, with the Baptist, had been within the margin of the stream. The word rendered *coming up* in our version, is generally rendered, in other parts of the New Testament, either *going up*, or *ascending*. See Matt. v, 1; xiv, 23; xv. 29; Mark iii, 13; vi, 51; x, 32; John i, 51; iii, 13; vi, 62; xx, 17.——*He saw the heavens cleft*:—Or, as the word is elsewhere rendered, *rent*, (Matt. xxvii. 51; Luke v, 36; John xix, 24), or *divided*, (Acts xiv, 4; xxiii, 7). Hammond and Young have *parted*,—a very good translation. Our word *schism* comes from the term employed by the evangelist; and so does our geological word *schist* or *splitting rock*. When it is said "*He* saw the heavens cleft," the reference is not to John, but to Jesus, although it is also true that John saw the wonderful phenomenon, as well as Jesus. (See John i, 33.) Dionysius à Ryckel hesitates whether to refer the statement to Jesus or to John. Grotius says that it *may* refer to John. Erasmus says that the reference is doubtful; and, in his Paraphrase, he divides it, attributing the word *ascending* to Jesus, and the word *saw* to John. Beza and Heumann refer both to John. But violently and unnaturally. The revelation from above was primarily intended for our Lord Himself, in his humanity. For, of course, there must have been steps of gradation, and times and seasons, in the development of his humanity.——*And the Spirit, like a dove, descending upon him*:—That was his true baptism,—the thing signified. It was his formal inauguration, in the year of his perfect maturity, his thirtieth year (Luke iii, 23), to his great work—a work that gathered up into itself all the greatest offices of human society. Henceforth the Lord was replenished, not only in actual fact, but to his own subjective consciousness, with all the fulness of influences that were required by his complex personality, to constitute him the official Head of the human race, the Prophet of prophets, the Priest of priests, the King of kings. It was *as a dove* that the Spirit descended on him,—a most captivating symbolism. The eagle too was in our Lord. Everything about him was mingled with the sublime. But the dove was predominant. Not only in his terrestrial career, but all along the ages, it is the power of his gentleness and tenderness and meekness—his love in short—that has been victorious. He has 'wooed' and won.

VER. 11. *And there came a voice out of the heavens, Thou art my Son, my Beloved; in thee I was well-pleased*:—The voice, it will be perceived, was not,

[q] Thou art my beloved [r]Son, in whom I am [s]well pleased.

12 [t]And immediately the spirit driveth him into

[q] Mat. 3. 17. Mar. 9. 7.
[r] Psa. 2. 7.
[s] Isai. 42. 1.
[t] Mat. 4. 1. Lu. 4. 1.

---

in the first instance at least, addressed to John. It was addressed to Jesus, and would thrill a variety of chords in his human heart, which would vibrate at once into the infinity of his higher being. The fulness of the Messianic self-consciousness would awake. Not the shadow of a film would obscure the glory of the fact that he was the Father's Son, and that he had been his Darling from everlasting, *(dilectus singularissima dilectione* –CAJETAN). *My Father has said it. I know my Father's voice. Everlasting memories come rushing in. He says that I am His Beloved! He used to say it before the foundation of the world. This mission which I have undertaken is dear, beyond expression, to His infinite heart. It is dear to mine too. I rejoiced from of old, in the habitable part of the earth, while as yet there was none of it, 'nor the highest part of the dust of the world.' He said, 'In thee I 'was' well-pleased!'—'was' from the first, and still 'am.' O how I delight, my Father, to do thy will! 'Thy' will is 'my' will. There has ever been, there will ever be, the inmost union of the two.* Instead of "*in whom* I was well-pleased" which is the reading of the Received Text, the best modern editors have '*in thee*' *I was well-pleased*. It is undoubtedly the correct reading, sanctioned by the manuscripts ℵ B D (in the Greek) L P Δ, 1, 33, 69, and by the Vulgate version, the Peshito Syriac, the Harclean Syriac (in the text), and the Armenian, Æthiopic, and Gothic versions. The reading of the Received Text has been borrowed from Matt. iii, 17, which presents the whole utterance from heaven, not as it was directly addressed to our Lord, but as it was indirectly apprehended by John who stood by. The two representations, we need scarcely say, are in absolute harmony.

VER. 12. *And immediately*:–Forthwith after his formal inauguration into his great Messianic work.———*The Spirit driveth him*:–The Divine Spirit, to wit, whose influence he had received in its fulness. *Driveth him*: Very literally *casteth him out*. The verb is generally thus rendered. It is the very verb that is employed to designate our Lord's *expulsion* of demons. (Mark i, 34, 39; iii, 15, 22, &c.) Wakefield renders it *leadeth out*,—a translation that completely draws the teeth of the original emphasis. Vehemency of impulse is represented. The Saviour felt an influence that must be yielded to, and yielded to without delay. The translation of the English Geneva of 1557 is graphic, *driveth him sodenly*. Sir John Cheke has *threw him*, which would suit Cartwright's idea that the reference is to a miraculous transport of our Saviour's person through the air. Wynne has *impelled him*; but the verb suggests *expelled* rather than *impelled*. It is rendered *expelled* in Acts xiii, 50. The expression means, as Petter says, *thrusteth him forth*; and perhaps it may be intended to subindicate the existence of some innocent reluctancy or shrinking of "the flesh."———*Into the wilderness*:–We know not what wilderness, and we do not need to know. Petter and others suppose that it was most likely the great wilderness of Arabia, in which the children of Israel wandered for forty years, and where Sinai is situated,—the scene of the giving of the Law and of the fasting of Moses. The traditional locality, however,

the wilderness. 13 And he was there in the wilderness

---

is near Jericho, a wild enough region, where rises the Mons Quarantania, or Jebel Kuruntil, "with its precipitous face pierced in every direction by ancient cells and chapels, and a ruined church on its topmost peak." There are multitudes of antique frescoes still fresh on the walls, "and generally," says Dr. Tristram, "every spring a few devout Abyssinian Christians are in the "habit of coming and remaining here for forty days, to keep their Lent on the "spot where they suppose our Lord to have fasted and been tempted." (*The Land of Israel*, pp. 207—217.)

VER. 13. *And he was (there) in the wilderness forty days*:—The *there* of the Received Text was evidently wanting in the original text. It is not in the Sinaitic (ℵ), Alexandrine (A), Vatican (B), and Cambridge (D) manuscripts: nor in 33—"the queen of the cursives." And it has nothing to represent it in the Italic, Vulgate, Coptic, Æthiopic, and Gothic versions. Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, wisely omit it from their texts.—*Forty days*:—Our Lord thus linked himself on, in consciousness, to the marvellous, and marvellously self-denying, experiences of Moses and Elijah, the greatest souls of the dispensation that foreshadowed the more spiritual dispensation which he himself was about to introduce. (See Exod. xxxiv, 28; Deut. ix, 9; 1 Kings xix, 8.) The foundations of all true greatness in human institutions must be laid in self-denial.———*Tempted by Satan*:—That is, *undergoing temptation by Satan*. It was fit, and perhaps inevitable, that our Lord should come into personal collision and conflict with the great adversary, whose works, and usurped dominion, he had come to destroy. There needed to be a great moral struggle, for there was already great antagonism between the two. And unless our Lord should have been able, while having all the secret springs of his aspirations and actions sifted to the uttermost, to pass through the fiery test unscathed, coming off an untarnished conqueror, and indeed "more than a conqueror," he would not have been fit to take his place at the head of the race, and to recover for mankind the Paradise that had been lost. None but the "Stronger than the strong" could deliver "the captives of the mighty." "The second Adam therefore," says Archbishop Trench, "taking up the "conflict exactly where the first had left it, and inheriting all the con-"sequences of his defeat, in the desert does battle with the foe; and, conquer-"ing him there, wins back the garden for that whole race, whose champion "and representative in this conflict He had been." (*Studies in the Gospel*, p. 8.) —*Satan*:—Or, as it is very literally, *the Satan;* just as we say *the Devil*. The word is as significant in Hebrew, as the word *Devil* or *Diabolos* in Greek. It means *adversary*, just as *Devil* means *accuser* or *slanderer*. The being so named is *the adversary both of God and of men*. He is no Myth. His actual agency abundantly bewrays itself. The unity, which is characteristic of the varied wickednesses of men, suggests it. The suicidal infatuation, which is a curious and inseparable element in almost every species of crime, but which is obtrusively conspicuous in some of the most popular forms of iniquity, bespeaks the presence of some mighty Malice behind the scenes, moving the springs of human action. We need not, therefore, discuss with C. Friedrich Gelbricht the question which he proposes, *Whether we should*

forty days, tempted of Satan; and was with the wild beasts; and the angels ministered unto him.

---

*require to 'think ill' of Jesus if he found his temptations simply springing up within himself?* or, as Gelbricht more strongly expresses it, *if he himself was his own Tempter? ("An male, ut nonnulli opinantur, de animo Jesu sentiendum sit, si ὁ πειράζων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ Christus ipse,* i. e. *mentis ipsius cogitata fuerint.")* Gelbricht answers his question in the negative, while he concedes that the hypothesis, on which it is erected, is probably to be accepted as true. We object, however, to the hypothesis.———*And he was with the wild beasts*:-This is added, not, as Hilgenfeld supposes, to suggest an analogy between our Lord and Adam in Paradise, *(Die Evangelien,* p. 126), but, as Petter says, "to show the desolate and forlorn state in "which our Saviour now was in the wilderness; being destitute of all help "and comfort from men, and having none to be his companions but wild "beasts, which were so far from helping or comforting him, that they were "more likely to annoy and hurt him, yea, to devour him." Of what kind the wild beasts were we do not know, and need not care to know. Even to the present day the desert places in and around the Holy Land swarm with such denizens, more especially wherever there are convenient *wadies* at hand, in which they may fix their homes or haunts. Dr. Tristram, in referring to Kuser Hajla, near Jericho, says,—"In its gorge we found a fine clump of date "palms,—one old tree, and several younger ones clustered round it, apparently "unknown to recent travellers, who state that the last palm-tree has lately "perished from the plains of Jericho. Near these palm trees, in the thick "cover, we came upon the lair of a leopard or cheetah, with a well-beaten "path, and the broad, round, unmistakeable footmarks quite fresh, and evi- "dently not more than a few hours old. However, the beast was not at home "for us. Doubtless it was one of these which M. de Saulcy took for the foot- "prints of the lion. But inasmuch as there is no trace of the lion having "occurred in modern times, while the others are familiar and common, we "must be quite content with the leopard. Everywhere around us were the "fresh traces of beasts of every kind; for two days ago a great portion of the "plain had been overflowed. The wild boar had been rooting and treading on "all sides: the jackals had been hunting in packs over the soft oozy slime; "the solitary wolf had been prowling about, and many foxes had singly been "beating the district for game. The hyæna, too, had taken his nocturnal "ramble in search of carcases. None of these, however, could we see." *(The Land of Israel,* pp. 245, 246.) When in the Wady Hamâm, again, in the district of Gennesaret, he says,—"We never met with so many wild animals "as on one of these days. First of all, a wild boar got out of some scrub close "to us, as we were ascending the valley. Then a deer was started below, ran "up the cliff, and wound along the ledge, passing close to us. Then a large "ichneumon almost crossed my feet, and ran into a cleft; and while endeav- "ouring to trace him, I was amazed to see a brown Syrian bear clumsily but "rapidly clamber down the rocks and cross the ravine. While working the "ropes above, we could see the gazelles tripping lightly at the bottom of the "valley, quite out of reach and sight of our companions at the foot of the cliff.

14 [u]Now after that John was [v]put in prison, [u] Mat. 4. 12.
Jesus came into Galilee, [w]preaching the gospel of [v] Mat. 14. 3.
[w] Mat. 4. 23. Lu. 8. 1.

---

"Mr. Lowne, who was below, saw an otter, which came out of the water, and "stood and looked at him for a minute with surprise." (*The Land of Israel*, p. 451.)———*And the angels ministered to him*:–In what way or ways, we are not told, nor how frequently, or at what conjuncture or conjunctures. See Matt. iii, 11.—Meyer infers from the extreme brevity of Mark's account of the temptation, that his report must be chronologically earlier, and less mythically developed, than that of Matthew. Baur, again, infers, from the obscurity that is involved in its brevity, and from the consequent need of Matthew's fuller narrative to make it plain, that it must be of the nature not of a germ, but of a subsequent condensation or epitome. (*Kritische Untersuchungen*, p. 540.) It is thus that conjecture devours conjecture. We take neither of the alternatives. We do not think on the one hand, that we have in Mark, or "the proto-Mark," the germ of Matthew; neither do we think on the other that the mystery of the relationship of the two evangelists is solved, when we try to school ourselves into Augustin's conviction that we are but hearing the echoes of Matthew, when we listen to the brief biographical sketches of Mark.

Ver. 14. *But after that John was put in prison*:–See Matt. xiv, 3—5; Luke iii, 19, 20. The expression *was put in prison*, while true to historic fact, is rather too free a translation. It was adopted and deteriorated from the Geneva version, "was committed *to prison*,"—the words *to prison* being printed in italic to intimate that they were a supplement. But the verb rendered *was committed* in the Geneva version, and misrendered *was put* in ours, simply means *was delivered (up)*, or *was betrayed*. These are the two customary translations, which it receives throughout the New Testament. Perhaps the Baptist had been *betrayed*, or *surrendered* as Dickinson renders the word, into the hands of Herod Antipas. Perhaps he was violently seized by the tyrant, and then *delivered over* to the custody of a guard of soldiers, and thus imprisoned. *Taken* is Wycliffe's version, and Tyndale's, and Coverdale's. *Delivered up* is the version of the Rheims; and Luther's corresponds (*überantwortet ward*).———*Jesus came into Galilee*:–The district where he had spent his youth. Not unlikely, in consequence of its distance from the capital, and its proximity to the Gentiles, it would not be so thoroughly priest-ridden, and Pharisee-ridden, as the district of Judea.———*Preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God*:–It is not improbable that the expression *of the kingdom* has been a supplement, taken in from the margin, and suggested to the marginal annotator from Matt. iv, 23; ix, 35. It was suspected by Griesbach. It is wanting in the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts (א B), and also in L, 1, 28, 33, 69, &c., and in the Coptic, Armenian, and Philoxenian Syriac versions. Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, omit it,—Meyer approving. The original expression would thus be, *preaching the gospel of God*. Jesus *preached*, or, very literally, *heralded*, that is, as Petter properly explains it, "published openly, by lively voice, and word of mouth." He preached *the gospel*:–He proclaimed that which is, by pre-eminence, *good news* or *glad tidings*. It was not his aim to

the kingdom of God, 15 and saying, [x]The time is fulfilled, and the [y]kingdom of God is at hand: [z]repent ye, and [a]believe the gospel.

[x] Dan. 2. 44. Dan. 9. 25. Gal. 4. 4.
[y] Mat. 4. 17.
[z] Mat. 3. 2. Acts 2. 38. [a] Rom. 1. 16.

accuse, or denounce, or condemn. It was in sadness of heart, if he ever, as in parenthesis, spoke words of accusation, denunciation, or condemnation. The burden of his proclamation was altogether different. It was a message of mercy. He "preached *the gospel of God*": He preached, that is to say, the good news which he had received in commission *from God*. The genitive *of God* is what grammarians call *the genitive of the author*, (genitivus auctoris).

VER. 15. *And saying, The time has been fulfilled*:-That is, *The measure of time that required to be completed has been completed*. A certain amount of time required to be "put in," ere all things should be ready for the establishment of the new order of things, or for the inauguration, in a more developed phase, of the kingdom of heaven. That amount of time had now been "put in." The appointed *measure* had been filled to the brim,—*fulfilled*, that is *filled-full*. The accumulation of days and weeks and months and years was complete. It was now "the fulness of the time." (Gal. iv, 4.)———*And the Kingdom of God has come nigh*:-What Matthew in general calls *the Kingdom of heaven* (see Matt. iv, 17) is designated by Mark and Luke *the Kingdom of God*. No other New Testament writer but Matthew employs the expression *the Kingdom of heaven*, though Paul has *the Lord's heavenly Kingdom* (2 Tim. iv, 18). The two expressions *the Kingdom of heaven* and *the Kingdom of God* are coincident in substrate. They vary only in phase. The Kingdom is divine and hence heavenly. It is a thing of heaven. It originated in heaven, tends to heaven, culminates in heaven. It is a heavenly community, with a heavenly sovereign at its head. All its subjects are heavenly, whether they be on earth or in heaven. Our whole earth should have been a part of heaven. But it is a runaway world, having gone off from heaven. It is not, however, finally lost to heaven. God—the Great Moral Governor—has not, and will not, let it go. He desires—not in the use of physical omnipotence, but by glorious moral means—to win it back. Long long ago he took the initiative for the accomplishment of this end. He reclaimed a foothold for heavenly institutions. And now the time was come for establishing, in a somewhat developed and as it were completed form, the heavenly Community—"the Kingdom of God."———*Repent*:-It was the burden of John's wilderness-"cry." Our Saviour takes it up; for it never can become obsolete, until sin has ceased to be. *Repentance from dead works* (Heb. vi, 1), *Repentance toward God* (Acts xx, 21), must ever be an integrant elementary theme of exhortation with all true preachers of righteousness. It implies, *firstly*, that men have been wrong in their conduct and character. It implies, *secondly*, that if they will but calmly and candidly *think back* over their ways, they will get to see that they have been wrong. Hence the solemn call *Repent!* as the antecedent of the joyful call *Believe!* Our English word is by no means a perfect or exceedingly precise synonym of the original Greek term, (μετανοεῖτε). The English *Repent* brings prominently into view the duty of *a penitent state of feeling*. The Greek term brings prominently into view the duty of *a pre-*

16 [b]Now as he walked by the sea of Galilee, he [b] Mat. 4. 18. Lu. 5. 4.

---

*liminary retrogressive acting of the intelligence,* (or νοῦς). This retrogressive acting of the intelligence, or *after-thought,* is only intended indeed to be preliminary, and if it did not issue in the conviction of the conscience, the sorrow of the heart, and the reformation of the life, it would be of no moral moment. It would be a useless mental fragment,—a beginning without its appropriate ending. Nevertheless it is the indispensable beginning of a right state of spirit and life on the part of all such moral creatures as have already been wrong in their character and conduct. (See on Matt. iii, 2.)———*And believe the gospel*:—Or rather, *and believe in the gospel.* The one expression may replace the other; but they differ in aspect of import. When we are said *to believe in the gospel,* the attention, so far as the form of the expression is concerned, is not carried farther than the gospel. Our faith is viewed as terminating *in* the gospel. When, again, we are said *to believe the gospel,* the attention is carried forward beyond the gospel, to the object concerning which the gospel testifies. The gospel is regarded as merely the medium whereby we may reach the Glorious Object. Both representations are true to the actual philosophy of the case; but the latter goes deeper in its draught. There are always two objects of faith or belief,—a proximate and an ultimate. The proximate is the testimony, (the *objectum quo*); the ultimate is the reality testified, (the *objectum quod*). The *gospel,* to which the Saviour referred, is, of course, just the good news that the time had now been fulfilled, and that the Kingdom of God had come near.

Ver. 16. *And as he passed along by the side of the sea of Galilee*:—Our translators, instead of *passed along* have *walked* (or *walked about*). It is Matthew's word (iv, 18), and was in the text of the editions that were lying before our translators. But *passing along* (παράγων) is the proper expression,—in accordance with the reading of the manuscripts ℵ B D L, 33, 69, and of the Italic, Vulgate, Coptic, and Armenian versions. It is the marginal reading too of the Harclean Syriac, and has been introduced into the text by Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles.—*The sea of Galilee*:—Or, *the sea of Tiberias,* or *lake of Gennesaret.* It was the centre of the circle of Galilee, and was called *the sea* by the surrounding inhabitants, for the same reason that Winder*mere,* Butter*mere,* Thirle*mere,* Gras*mere,* were regarded of old as seas. It was *a large water.* The Jews had also their *Dead Sea* or *Salt Sea.* But the Mediterranean was "the *great* sea." Dr. Tristram, describing his approach to the sea of Galilee from Nazareth, says,—"For nearly three hours we had ridden on, with "Hermon in front, sparkling through its light cloud-mantle, but still no sight "of the Sea of Galilee. One ridge after another had been surmounted, when "on a sudden, the calm blue basin, slumbering in placid sweetness beneath its "surrounding wall of hills, burst upon us, and we were looking down on the "hallowed scenes of our Lord's ministry. We were on the brow of a very "steep hill. Below us was a narrow plain, sloping to the sea, the beach of "which we could trace to its northern extremity. At our feet lay the city of "Tiberias, the only remaining town on its shores, enclosed by crumbling for-"tifications with shattered but once massive round bastions. Along that

saw Simon and Andrew his brother casting a net into the

---

"fringe, could we have known where to find them, lay the remains of Chorazin, "Bethsaida, and Capernaum. Opposite to us were the heights of the country "of the Gadarenes, and the scene of the feeding of the 5,000. On some one "of the slopes beneath us the Sermon on the Mount was delivered. The first "gaze on the Sea of Galilee, lighted up with the bright sunshine of a spring "afternoon, was one of the moments of life not soon or easily forgotten. It "was different from my expectations; our view was so commanding. In some "respect it recalled in miniature the first view of the Lake of Geneva, from "the crest of the Jura, as it is approached by the old Besançon road—Hermon "taking the place of Mont Blanc, the plain of Gennesaret recalling the Pays "de Vaud, and the steep banks opposite the bold coast of Savoy. All looked "small for the theatre of such great events, but all the incidents seemed "brought together as in a diorama. There was a calm peacefulness in the "look of these shores on the west, with the paths by the water's edge, which "made them the fitting theatre for the delivery of the message of peace "and reconciliation." (*The Land of Israel*, pp. 426, 427.)———*He saw Simon*:—Or Simeon. See Acts xv, 14; 2 Pet. i, 1 (Gr.). The pronunciation *Simeon* is nearest the Hebrew original. He was called Peter by our Lord. Simon or Simeon means *Hearing*, (that is, perhaps, *there has been hearing on the part of God*). ———*And Andrew the brother of Simon*:—Such is the full reading of the correct text. Andrew, unlike Simon or Simeon, is a Greek word, meaning *Manly*. ———*Casting a net into the sea*:—Or, literally, according to the correct reading, (ἀμφιβάλλοντας ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ), *throwing about in the sea*, (viz. a hand-net). It is one of Mark's vivid touches. The thing that the men were throwing about is not named. It is supposed that it would be sufficiently understood; and no doubt the phrase *throwing about* would just be a customary fisherman's expression. The *about* is graphic in the original. It represents the fishermen throwing now on the one side of their boat, and now on the other; (ἀμφί is connected with *ambo*). Hand-nets are exceedingly common in the east, and of various kinds. They differ from drag-nets, which are trailed along the bottom of the fishing-place. Hand-nets are let down and lifted up, and are more or less of a bag shape. In some manuscripts, inclusive of Beza's (D), the plural word *nets* is supplied after the participle *throwing-about*. But in Matt. iv, 18, a singular noun, *a hand-net*, is employed. And it more accords with the habits of the east to suppose that there would be but one net in operation at a time between the two fishermen. One of the two men would manage the boat, and take charge of the fishes caught, while the other was engaged in throwing the net and lifting it up. There is not in the east, and there would not be in the time of Simon and Andrew, that intense activity and haste or hurry, that are characteristic of many of our British fishermen.———*For they were fishermen*:—Of a humble calling indeed; but still, in the exercise of it, the men were trained to habits which were, in many respects, well fitted to prepare them for higher duties. The successful use of the hand-net requires in the fisherman, says Dr. W. M. Thomson, "a keen eye, an active frame, and great skill in "throwing. He must, too, be patient, watchful, wide awake, and prompt to "seize the exact moment to throw." (*The Land and the Book*, p. 402.)

sea: for they were fishers. 17 And Jesus said unto them, Come ye after me, and I will make you to become fishers of men. 18 And straightway they forsook their nets, and followed him. 19 And when he had gone a little farther thence, he saw James the *son* of Zebedee, and John his brother, who also were in the ship mending their nets.

---

VER. 17. *And Jesus said unto them, Come after me*:-This, of course, was not the first time that they had met. Simon and Andrew had been disciples of John the Baptist, and, while following him, had introduced themselves to the Saviour. (John i, 35—42.) They had evidently been earnest men looking out wistfully for the good time of which the prophets had spoken, and longing to be engaged in any labour of love that might be helpful to the glorious cause of God. The expression *Come after me*, while conventionally meaning *Become my pupils*, was moulded on the natural and seemly custom of allowing precedence to the Rabbi, while walking along.———*And I will make you to become fishers of men*:-I will fit you for higher work,—for a spiritual sphere, a sphere in which you will operate on men, and be successful in catching them. The figure must not be pressed or strained.

VER. 18. *And straightway*:-Without any hesitation.———*They left the nets, and followed him*:-They left *the nets* that were in their boat. It is *their nets* that is the reading of the Received Text. But *the nets* is the more graphic reading of the manuscripts ℵ B C L, 33—"the queen of the cursives," and 69; and of the Vulgate version, and the Coptic, and Armenian. Griesbach suspected the *their*, and Lachmann, Tischendorf (8th edition), and Tregelles have thrown it out. Simon and Andrew, having drawn their boat ashore, left it in the hands of some assistants, and *followed* Jesus, or, as Wycliffe has it, picturesquely, *thei sueden hym* (they pursued him). It is interesting to note the brotherliness of the brothers. They had worked together in their secular calling, and they were not divided in their attachment to Jesus.

VER. 19. *And when he went forward a little*:-The *thence* of the Received Text is omitted by Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford.———*He saw James the son of Zebedee and John his brother*:-Another pair of brotherly brothers. John, though afterwards the more conspicuous of the two, had evidently been the younger, and hence is generally named after James, and distinguished as "the brother of James." In Mark he always occupies this secondary position, as also in Matthew. In Luke, however, he is, on one occasion, mentioned before James, as if the knowledge of his ultimate eminence had, for the time, displaced the original association of sequence. See Luke ix, 28.———*Who also were in the boat*:-The boat, namely, that belonged to them, and hence it might be legitimately rendered *in their boat*. Wynne and the Unitarian "Improved Version" have *in a ship*, which is certainly no improvement on the authorized translation. Principal Campbell has *in a bark*, borrowing from, but deteriorating, the version of Mace, *in the bark*. It is noteworthy that Wycliffe and Sir John Cheke have *boat* instead of *ship*, which was Tyndale's word, and not equal to *boat*.———*Mending their nets*:-Making them *complete*, as the word means. It is "*the* nets" in the original, that is *the nets that belonged to them*. It will be noticed that the

20 And straightway he called them: and they left their father Zebedee in the ship with the hired servants, and went after him.

21 And they went into Capernaum; and straightway on

---

influence of the *also* in the preceding clause is left indefinite. We know, however, from the facts of the two cases, which are compared by the evangelist, that it does not prolong itself into this second clause.

VER. 20. *And straightway he called them: and they left their father Zebedee with the hired servants, and went away after him*:—There would be something in the call, and in the mien and bearing of him who gave it, that would entirely forestall any questioning or doubting. The behest was, as it were, from heaven; and it conferred at once the highest honour and the greatest privilege. They felt that they must not be disobedient to it. But, at the same time, they did not leave their father unprovided for. He had *hired servants*. "These "disciples," says Petter, "did not so wholly and utterly forsake their goods "and friends, as never afterward to use them any more upon occasion; "but they forsook them in regard of the ordinary use of them, and so far "forth only as they might hinder them in their ordinary conversing with "Christ, and following of him."

VER. 21. *And they enter into Capernaum*:—Note the present tense, *they enter*. We are carried back in imagination to the time referred to, and see them walking along, and entering the adjacent town. It was Capernaum, the home for the present of Simon and Andrew. (See verse 29, and comp. John i, 44.) The precise spot on which the town lay is disputed. It has, in modern times, been generally supposed to be the place now called Tell Hûm, at the north-west angle of the Lake, where three or four acres of ground are strewed with interesting architectural remains,—"sarcophagi of white marble, fragments of "marble shafts,—some of them double columns,—friezes, pilasters, capitals, "and portions of elaborate carvings, most of them in a debased style, besides "a few large fragments of walls, extending to some distance beyond; yet, "excepting one large piece of an entablature, curiously carved, there is nothing "to particularize, but quite enough to prove ancient wealth and importance." (Tristram's *Land of Israel*, pp. 441, 442.) Dr. Robinson, however, argues strongly in favour of Khân Minyeh, as the site, at 'Ain et-Tîn, considerably south of Tell Hûm. (*Later Researches*, pp. 347—359.) Dr. Porter is disposed to agree with Dr. Robinson, more especially as Captain Wilson thinks that he has discovered the remains of an ancient aqueduct, which conveyed the waters of 'Ain Tabighah into the region around. (*Syria and Palestine*, p. 407.) Dr. Tristram, again, contends that its situation must likely have been still more to the south and farther west, at the Round Fountain of Mudawarah. Josephus, in his description of the plain of Gennesaret,—or Gennesar, as he calls it,—says that it is "watered by a most prolific fountain, which the people of the place call Kapharnaum," (πηγῇ διάρδεται γονιμωτάτῃ, Καφαρναοὺμ αὐτὴν οἱ ἐπιχώριοι καλοῦσι). He proceeds to say that "this fountain produces a fish like the *coracine*, which is found in the marsh-pool at Alexandria." (*War*, iii, 10. 8.) This coracine or cat-fish is quite a remarkable siluroid, which delights to bury itself in sediment, leaving only its feelers exposed. Dr. Tristram *found*

the sabbath day he entered into the synagogue, and taught.

---

*it abounding in the Round Fountain of Mudawarah*, and carried off specimens a yard long,—some of which he has deposited in the British Museum. In "the fountain of the fig" (*'Ain et-Tîn*) at Khân Minyeh, there are no coracines. The fountain there, says Dr. Tristram, "could neither supply it with cover nor food." And as regards Tell Hûm, there is, it seems, no fountain at all in the place. Neither is there any in its neighbourhood, nearer than 'Ain Tabighah, that could possibly correspond to the Kapharnaum of Josephus. But 'Ain Tabighah is two miles to the south; and Dr. Tristram could not discover in it any trace of the coracine. 'Ain et-Tîn again at Khân Minyeh cannot be said *to water the plain;* it is so close to the lake. "It lies much too low," says Dr. Porter, "to irrigate the plain." But 'Ain Mudawarah meets, as Dr. Tristram thinks, all the requirements of Josephus's description. "The basin of 'Ain Mudawarah is unlike," he says, "any other we have seen. "In the centre of a well-built circular reservoir, about thirty yards in "diameter, is a plenteous spring. The walls are about eight feet high, and "the water was now three feet deep, and occasionally a little more. The "stream gushes through a little opening at the east side, and being "immediately joined by several other streamlets, flows down to the lake in "a deep channel fringed with oleanders and brambles." (*The Land of Israel*, pp. 438—448.) How marvellous that there should be such difficulty in identifying the Lord's "own city"! (Matt. ix, 1.) How thoroughly has it been brought down to the dust! (See Matt. xi, 23.)———*And straightway* :–Without "losing any time" as we say, or letting slip any opportunity. The word rendered *straightway*, and sometimes *forthwith*, or *immediately*, or *anon*, is a favourite with Mark. He has already used it in verses 10, 12, 18, 20. He uses it also, before the end of the present chapter, in verses 28, 29, 30, 31, 42, 43.———*On the sabbath day* :–A correct translation, though the expression is plural in the original, and is translated plurally in Luke iv, 31. It is plural, because the Aramaic form of the word *sabbath* sounded, to the ears of Greeks, like a plural,—*shabbata*, *sabbata*. Compare our English word *riches*, which, though plural in form, was, originally at least, a singular noun, *richesse*, and is so used by Chaucer, for instance, who makes it rhyme with *princesse*. (l. 1831. See on Matt. xii, 1.) Euthymius Zigabenus was misled by the plural form of the Evangelist's word, and interpreted the phrase as meaning *on the sabbath-days*. The Vulgate translator made the same mistake, and Luther too, and Tyndale and Coverdale, and Matthew Henry likewise. Apparently Wakefield also, for he renders the whole clause thus,—*And he constantly went on the sabbath-day*. Our authorized translators have in several places made the same mistake. ———*He entered into the synagogue* :–Tischendorf omits the word *entered*. But if it was not in the Evangelist's autograph, it requires to be mentally supplied. The Elzevir edition of 1624 has *into synagogue*, or *into a synagogue*, instead of *into the synagogue*. Wrongly, however. The good manuscripts have the article. And there would most probably be only one Synagogue in so small a place as Capernaum. It had apparently been but recently erected. When the elders of the Jews, at a subsequent time, said to our Lord con-

22 [c]And they were astonished at his doctrine: for he taught them as one that had authority, and not

[c] Mat. 7. 28. Lu. 4. 32.

Lu. 7. 16.

cerning the centurion, "and he hath built us *a synagogue*" (Luke vii. 5), it is *the synagogue* in the original.—The word *synagogue*—or *sinagogge* as Tyndale has it in his 1526 edition,—primarily meant *a meeting* or *assembly*. It thence came to denote *a meeting place*, its meaning here. Luther renders it *school*. It denotes the edifice in which the Jews met together for the reading and explaining of their Scriptures, and the offering up of prayers.———*And taught*:—Liberty of speech was allowed in the synagogues, though of course under certain conventional restrictions. (See Vitringa *de Synyoga vetere*, iii, 1. 7.) All therefore who had a word to say, and could say it with propriety, —more especially if they were manifestly Rabbis, or were apparently fit, either by man's teaching or by God's, to be Rabbis,—had an opportunity of addressing their fellow-worshippers. It was a plan that would tend in some instances to confusion, and irreverent disputing; but it was fitted, on the other hand, to foster a spirit of freedom and freshness. It was a counterpoise to the absolute officialism of the sacerdotal service.

VER. 22. *And they were astonished at his teaching*:—The word rendered *doctrine* in our Authorized Version (διδαχή), does not draw attention exclusively, like our English word *doctrine* in its modern acceptation, to the subject-matter of the teaching. It just means *teaching*, and allows therefore the mind to oscillate, as the case may be, between the two ideas of the subject-matter, and the manner, of the teaching. Here, as is obvious from the next clause, there is special reference to our Lord's manner of teaching. Wycliffe, indeed, renders the term *techynge*, even though translating from the Vulgate, which has *doctrina*. Tyndale has *learninge*, by which perhaps he may have meant *teaching*, as the word was for long "ambidextrous," and still is so in certain localities. In Anglo-Saxon the word *learning-man* means indifferently either a schoolmaster or a scholar; and the verb *leran* means *to teach*.———*For he was teaching them as having authority*:—He could not conceal from himself that he was *a master* and *the master* in all things moral, spiritual, and Scriptural, and entitled therefore to do something more than merely propose his opinion. He did not need to speak as one who was in doubt,—or as one who realized that he might be mistaken. He could not, in honesty, thus speak. There would be meekness, indeed, and the sweetest condescension; but there could be no doctrinal diffidence. (See Matt. v, 20, 22, 28, 32, 34, 39, 44.) Not only, however, would there be the absence of doctrinal diffidence, there would at the same time be the presence in his teaching, to an unprecedented degree, of the self-evidencing power of the truth. The light would shine, as in a blaze, through all that he said; and it would be impossible for ingenuous men to puzzle themselves into a debate whether it was really light or darkness. Jesus, says Matthew Henry, was "a *non-such* preacher."——— *And not as the scribes*:—The *scribes* were the learned men of the Jewish nation, the men who had to do with *letters*, (γραμματεῖς). Almost all the writing that was required in the nation would be done by them. Most of the reading

as the scribes. 23 [d]And there was in their synagogue a man with an [e]unclean spirit; and he

[d] Lu. 4. 33.
[e] Mat. 10. 1. Mat. 12. 43.

---

too. The transcribing of the Scriptures would devolve on them; and as the nation was emphatically ecclesiastical, the chief currents of their engagements would flow in a biblical and religious direction. Hence the interpretation of the Law and the Prophets, in the Synagogues, would devolve chiefly on them; and the people would, to a large degree, be dependent on their instructions. They would vary greatly, like other men, in ability, character, and qualifications. But it would appear that in the time of our Lord, the great bulk of them were pedantic in things that were obvious enough, and frivolous and jejune in all things that lay beyond. They would be admirable guessers, and mighty in platitudes. They would be ingenious in raising microscopic doubts; and perfect adepts in conjuring up conceit to do battle with conceit. They would be skilful in splitting hairs to infinity, and they would be proud of their ability to lead their hearers through the endless mazes of the imaginations of preceding Rabbis,—imaginations that ended in nothing, or in something that was actually worse than nothing. But they would have no power, or almost none, to move the conscience toward true goodness, or to stir the love of the heart toward God and toward men. They might speak, indeed, with positiveness enough; but it would not be with moral power. They might assert with dictatorial self-sufficiency; but it would not be with "demonstration of the Spirit,"—demonstration flashing-in conviction even upon reluctant and hard-winking souls.

VER. 23. *And there was in their synagogue a man with an unclean spirit*:—Or, more literally, *a man 'in' an unclean spirit*, that is, a man under the influence of an unclean spirit; just as we say, *a man 'in' drink*, or, more pleasantly, *a man 'in' love*. For the time being the man is absorbed, as it were, in love, or in drink. So the demoniac was absorbed as it were *into* the demon, and was completely under its power, or, as we may say, *within* its power. There were such demoniacs of old; and there is little reason for doubting that there are such demoniacs still, though demonism, like many other agencies, obvious and occult, has varied in its phases in the course of the ages. There is manifestly a spiritual side of things, the counterpart of that material side that is open to our apperception through our senses. It is entirely arbitrary, and a mere wilful imagination, to suppose that in this spiritual side of things there is no other spiritual element, no spiritism, except what is human. The universe is large. Worlds are linked to worlds. Evil and good are strangely commingled. God is everywhere,—and He is a Spirit. There is therefore some other spiritism than what is human. And as regards the sphere of creation, we may be sure that it is not a mere spiritual wilderness, or waste, or vacuum, round about man. There are hosts of spirits, at once hierarchically ascending, and contrariwise descending. Influences from both directions press in upon men: and hence the demoniacal possessions of Scripture. It is in some respects a marvellous mode of influence, but yet by no means more marvellous than some other modes distinctively mental. If human spirits be wonderfully correlated to their bodies, as they are, it need not amaze us that demonic spirits, if having influence

cried out, 24 saying, Let *us* alone; [f]what have we to do with thee, thou Jesus [g]of Nazareth? art thou come to destroy us? I know thee who thou art,

[f] Mat. 8. 29.
[g] John 2. 4.
Acts 22. 8.

---

at all beyond the circle of their own spiritual selves, should seek to enter and should be able on certain conditions to enter into some abnormal correlations, not to human spirits only, but to the bodies of these spirits. The man, of whom the Evangelist speaks, was in the power of *an unclean spirit*. Possibly he was "suffering," as Schenkel will have it, "from religious mania," (*Character of Jesus*, v, 3). But that explains nothing. Religious mania requires itself to be explained. The demon was *unclean, impure, unholy*. Holiness is cleanness. Wickedness or unholiness is foulness, or the defilement of the soul.———*And he cried out*:-Godwin translates, *and 'it' cried out*. But the nominative to the verb is the word *man*, whose mouth and voice were employed by the unclean spirit.

VER. 24. *Saying, Let us alone*:-The interjection (ἔα) which is here freely translated *Let us alone!* has most probably been imported into the text from Luke iv, 34, where it is no doubt genuine. It is omitted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford. It is not found in the manuscripts ℵ B D, nor in the Italic, Vulgate, Syriac Peshito, Coptic, Æthiopic, Arabic, and Persic versions. It is an exclamation denoting displeasure. (See *Fritzsche.*)——— *What have we to do with thee?*-Or rather, *What hast thou to do with us?* Very literally *What to us and to thee?* It is a peculiar idiomatic expression, meaning *What is there in common to us and to thee?* As here applied, it is deprecatory, and means *Why dost thou interfere with us?* (See Kypke; and compare John ii, 4; also Judg. xi, 12; 2 Sam. xvi, 10; 1 Kin. xvii, 18; 2 Kin. iii, 13; Matt. viii, 29.) The Saviour had not—so far as appears—been formally interfering by any specific action. But his very presence on the scene was felt to be interference. There emanated from him, round about, an influence that went in upon men blissfully, counter-working all evil influences. The unclean spirit felt the power, and resented it as an interference,—an interference not with itself in particular, but with the entire circle of kindred spirits. "What hast thou to do with *us?*"———*Thou Jesus of Nazareth!* There is no *thou* in the original; and it rather encumbers the address. It is properly omitted by Luther and the Rheims translator. It was inserted, however, both by Wycliffe and by Tyndale. Beza supposes that there was diabolic artifice in referring to Nazareth instead of Bethlehem. Trapp echoes the idea, and Matthew Henry. Petter says, "but this I leave as uncertain, although it is not altogether unlikely." It is, however, a manifest strain, and gives the evil one more than was his due. See Luke xxiv, 19; Acts ii, 22; iii, 6; iv, 10; x, 38; xxii, 8. Jesus belonged to Nazareth, as truly as to Bethlehem; and his connection with Nazareth would be much better known, and would be therefore more discriminative as an appellation, than his connection with Bethlehem.———*Art thou come to destroy us?*-Or, more literally, *Camest thou to destroy us?* It is not quite certain, however, whether we should read the words interrogatively, or affirmatively,—*Thou camest to destroy us.* The majority of editors and expositors take them interrogatively. Luther, however, gives them affirmatively. Wetstein also. Bengel gave them inter-

the [h]Holy One of God. 25 And Jesus rebuked him, saying, Hold thy peace, and come out of him. 26 And when the unclean spirit had torn him, and cried

[h] Luke 1. 35. Acts 3. 14.

---

rogatively in his 1st and 2d editions, but in his 3d edition of 1753 he removed the interrogation-point. In his German version also, of the same date, he gives the expression affirmatively. So Griesbach, and Scholz; also Knapp, Tittmann, Vater, Näbe, Ornsby. Tischendorf too in his 7th and 8th editions, though not in his preceding edition of 1849. Fritzsche pleads for the affirmative reading. Ewald assumes it. It is not a matter of much moment which of the two views be embraced. In what goes before there is interrogation, and in what comes after there is affirmation. On the whole we prefer the interrogative view, though we would not have the interrogation strongly pronounced. It is much of the nature of exclamation, and expresses deprecation. The evil spirit knew, in general, what was the aim of the mission of Jesus, but we need not suppose that he knew with absolute precision and far-reaching range, and hence the interrogative element. Grotius votes for the interrogation, chiefly on the ground of correspondence with Matthew viii, 29. Note the *us*,—*Camest thou to destroy 'us'? Is it the intent of thy mission to put down all demonic power?* Note the word *destroy*. It has no reference to the annihilation of being. Usurpers are destroyed when their usurpation is destroyed.———*I know thee who thou art*:—The Sinaitic manuscript and Tischendorf read *We know thee*, instead of *I know thee*. Were it the correct reading, it would represent the unclean spirit as speaking in the name of his fellows. They had inter-communication one with another about their affairs, and they all knew that Jesus had come, and that he was from above. Doubtless, however, *I know thee* is the correct reading. It is overwhelmingly supported by the real authorities; and it is the reading of Luke iv, 34.———*The holy one of God*:—That is, *the holy one belonging to God*, viz. as God's great agent in relation to the salvation of men. The demon gives emphasis to the moral transcendency, the sinlessness, of the Saviour. It was the phase of our Lord's being that was in the most absolute antagonism to the character and influence of "the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience." It was the edge of the sword that was about to gain the victory. The confession, we may suppose, would be extorted under the pressure of the moment; or, it may have been crookedly contrived to throw discredit on our Lord as receiving commendation from a questionable quarter.

Ver. 25. *And Jesus rebuked him*:—Instead of *rebuked*, Coverdale has *reproved*, and Wycliffe *thretenyde*. The original word is very peculiar (ἐπετίμησεν), and strictly means *rated*. Our Saviour *chid* the evil spirit. He never on any occasion gave any quarter to anything demonic.———*Saying, Hold thy peace, and come out of him*:—Whether the demon's confession were simply extorted, or diabolically contrived, our Lord laid his interdict upon it. He knew that it could not emanate from any good intent, or from any real appreciation. It was one of his aims in coming into the world to silence Satan. The word translated *Hold thy peace* (φιμώθητι) is exceedingly graphic, *Be muzzled*. It is a word for a beast. (See 1 Cor. ix, 9; 1 Tim. v, 18.)

Ver. 26. *And the unclean spirit convulsed him, and cried with a loud voice,*

with a loud voice, he came out of him. 27 And they were all amazed, insomuch that they questioned among themselves, saying, What thing is this? what new doctrine *is* this? for with authority commandeth he even the unclean spirits, and they do obey him.

---

*and came out of him* :-*Convulsed him*, no doubt epileptically, throwing him to the ground, and, as it were, *tearing at* him, though not actually, as Cardinal Cajetan remarks, *severing member from member*. Wycliffe's word is *debrekynge hym*, that is, *breaking him down*.—*Cried with a loud voice* :—"Not that he "uttered any words or speech," says Petter, "as he did before, but only a "confused hideous noise." It was with a grudge that he let go his prey.

VER. 27. *And all were amazed, so that they questioned together* :–Such is the translation of Tischendorf's text, (ὥστε συνζητεῖν αὐτούς), as supported by the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts. The Received Text is, in this case, slightly unsettled, (πρὸς αὐτούς, Stephens; πρὸς αὑτούς, Elzevir); but, under either form, it is well represented by our Authorized Version, *insomuch that they questioned among themselves*. Tyndale's version is, *in so moche that they demaunded one of another amonge themselves*. Each turned to his neighbour, in astonishment, to ask his opinion.———*Saying, What is this? New teaching with authority! And he commandeth the unclean spirits, and they obey him!*– Such is, apparently, the correct reading and rendering of the abrupt remarks which the astonished people made to one another, (διδαχὴ καινὴ κατ' ἐξουσίαν· καὶ τοῖς πνεύμασιν κ. τ. λ.) The word *doctrine*, in our Authorized Version, instead of *teaching*, is unhappy. There is no reference to any supposed peculiarity of *dogma* or *tenet*. (See *v.* 22.) Wycliffe has *techyng*. But Purvey, in his revision, unfortunately replaced it with *doctrine*, which is also Tyndale's word, and in the Geneva too, and the Rheims. As to the *what*, before the expression *new teaching*, it is wanting in the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts (א B), and L, and 1, and 33—"the queen of the cursives." It is not found in the Coptic, Armenian, and Æthiopic versions. And it is properly omitted from the text by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford. Meyer approves of the omission. The people remarked to one another, *New teaching with a witness! New especially in relation to authority! We never heard anything like that before! And he lays his injunctions on the unclean spirits and they obey him!* Lachmann and Tregelles put a stop,—the former a colon, the latter a comma,—after *New teaching!* and connect the expression *with authority*, or *in a way of authority*, with the following clause;—*With authority he lays his injunctions even on the unclean spirits, and they obey him!* The other method of construction, however, is simpler, and more in accordance with what is said in verse 22, *he was teaching them as having authority*. The *authority* had impressed itself on the people's hearts and consciences; *and, in addition to that*, they marvelled at the decisive and successful way in which he dealt with the unclean spirit. They say *the unclean spirits*, for by an easy process of generalization they referred the particular case in hand to the category to which it belonged. As to the *for* or *because* (ὅτι) that goes before the expression *with authority* in the Received Text, it is omitted by the same manuscripts which omit the *what* before *new doctrine!*

28 And immediately his fame spread abroad throughout all the region round about Galilee.

29 [i]And forthwith, when they were come out of the synagogue, they entered into the house of Simon

[i] Mat. 8. 14. Lu. 4. 38.

---

Ver. 28. *And his fame went out immediately in all directions into the whole surrounding district of Galilee* :–It flew, as it were, on the wings of the wind. *His fame* :–literally, *the report of him*, or, more literally still, *the hearing of him*, that is, the hearing of which he was the object.—*Immediately* :–This word is omitted in the Sinaitic manuscript (ℵ*), but not in the Vatican, as Tregelles had been led to suppose. It is omitted also in the important cursive manuscripts 1 and 33. But doubtless it is genuine. It was just like Mark to insert it. (See on *vv.* 21 and 30.) And it is peculiarly appropriate in such a case as the present, for no doubt the report concerning Jesus would spread like wildfire. *In all directions*, or *everywhere*, (πανταχοῦ) :–a word not in the Received Text, nor admitted by Lachmann, but received by Tischendorf on the authority of ℵc B C L, 69, &c.—*Into the whole surrounding district of Galilee* :–Such is evidently the meaning of the evangelist's expression. Our translators seem to have supposed that the reference was to *the district which surrounded Galilee*. So Tyndale, *all the region borderinge on Galilee*. The Geneva follows Tyndale. Cajetan takes the same view, and Erasmus, Beza, Petter, Elsner, Fritzsche, Meyer, Lange;—some of them misled, apparently, by Matt. iv, 24. Grotius hesitates. But both the Peshito version and the Vulgate give the right view. Wycliffe's translation is, *in to al the cuntree of Galilee*. So le Fèvre, Diodati, de Dieu strongly, Beausobre, Wolf, Bengel, Principal Campbell, Burton, Baumgarten-Crusius, Rilliet, Webster and Wilkinson, Klostermann.

Ver. 29. *And forthwith* :–The same word that is rendered *immediately* in the preceding verse. The two verses, however, run out with their respective *immediatelys* on different lines. The former takes note of the rapid general impression produced in the district at large. This takes note of what happened in Capernaum just after the dismission of the people from the synagogue.———*When they were come out of the synagogue* :–*They*, that is, Jesus and his four disciples. The evangelist is not studying his phrases. He was thinking of our Saviour and his four disciples generally, and begins to speak of them collectively; but, as he proceeds, he descends to particulars, in a manner that might be regarded as confused by a fastidious composer, but that is in reality subservient to a distinct apprehension of the state of the case.———*They went into the house of Simon and Andrew* :–See verse 16.———*With James and John* :–See verse 19. Although the evangelist, when commencing this verse, had in his mind Jesus and his four disciples, inclusive of course of James and John; yet, when he proceeded to tell where the company went, he deemed it a fitting particularization to add *with James and John*, lest they should be lost sight of in the generalization of the first part of the verse. It is not an utterly extravagant idea of Klostermann's that the evangelist's phraseology may probably be moulded on a report from Peter himself (see Papias in *Eusebius's Eccles. History*, iii, 39), which might run in some such way as the following,—"*And immediately on coming out of the*

and Andrew, with James and John. 30 But Simon's wife's mother lay sick of a fever, and anon they tell him of her. 31 And he came and took her by the hand, and lifted her up; and immediately the fever left her, and she ministered unto them.

32 *j*And at even, when the sun did set, they *j* Mat. 8. 16. Lu. 4. 40.

---

*synagogue we* (that is, Jesus, James and John, and my brother Andrew and I) *went into* OUR *house.*"

VER. 30. *But Simon's wife's mother*:-Tyndale, in his 1526 edition, has *Symones motherelawe.* In his subsequent edition of 1534 he opens up the crushed expression, *Symons mother in lawe.* This is also Coverdale's translation, and that of the first Geneva in 1557. The subsequent Geneva, or the Geneva proper, and the Rheims, have the translation that is repeated in our Authorized translation.———*Was lying in fever*: She *lay prostrate*, (κατέκειτο). —*In fever*:-as if she had been *on fire*, (πυρέσσουσα). Coverdale uses a plural expression, *and had the fevers.* "Country fever is to this day," says Tristram, "very prevalent in this seething plain and on its borders; and such a position "as 'Ain Mudawarah would be peculiarly subject to it." (*The Land of Israel*, p. 448.)———*And straightway they speak to him concerning her*:-*Straightway*, or *anon* as it is in our Authorized version; (*anone*, Coverdale; *anoon*, Wycliffe and Purvey). It is our evangelist's favourite *immediately*, (εὐθύς instead of the εὐθέως of the Textus Receptus). In this his first chapter, it occurs ten or eleven times, (eleven times in the Received Text). It only occurs eight times in the whole Gospel of Luke, and four times in John's Gospel, and fifteen times in the Gospel of Matthew.

VER. 31. *And he approached, and took her by the hand, and raised her*:-Or, as we should say, *assisted her up.* The perfect self-possession and calm confidence of our Lord are beautifully indicated. There was no hesitancy on the one hand; and no bustle on the other. He simply put himself in connection with the patient, and the matter was done.———*And immediately the fever left her*:-The "virtue" that went forth from the Lord restored instantaneously the physical equilibrium of the patient. He willed, "and it was done." He is thus the great healer and rectifier not only in the inner or moral sphere of the nature which he assumed; but also in the outer or material sphere. When once his will shall be absolutely dominant in the world, as one day it shall be, there will be no more disease.—Strange to say the *immediately* of this clause is not found in the Sinaitic, Vatican, and Ephraemi manuscripts (ℵ B C), nor in L, and 1, and 33—"the queen of the cursives." It is omitted by Tischendorf and Tregelles. But if Mark did not write it, he certainly meant it.———*And she ministered to them*:-She served them, or waited on them, when they sat down to partake of their humble repast. The fever had not burned up her strength before it was expelled, and left her prostrate. It was itself burned out and left her strength unimpaired.

VER. 32. *But at even, when the sun set*:-*At even*, or, as Purvey has it, *whanne the eventid was come;* that is, when the Sabbath was ended. It was a matter of religion with the Jews to do as little work as possible, even in the

brought unto him all that were diseased, and them that were possessed with devils. 33 And all the city was gathered together at the door. 34 And he healed many that were

---

way of curing diseases, on the Sabbath day;—not a bad principle of action, when kept in the guidance of love and reason, instead of being committed to the leading-strings of superstition. (See Danz's *Curatio Sabbathica.*———*They brought to him all the diseased and the demoniac*:–The term *diseased*, in its current modern acceptation, is perhaps a trifle too strong to represent the import of the original expression (κακῶς ἔχοντας); but, when looked at etymologically, *dis–eased*, that is, *sundered from ease*, or *ill at ease*, and thus *unwell*, it is all that could be desired. The demoniacs referred to are described, in our Authorized Version, as *they that were possessed with devils.* It is no doubt a correct enough description; but the word *devil* or *devils* is never used in the original, when demoniacs are spoken of. It is always the word *demon* or *demons*, or the generic term *spirit* or *spirits.* In Greek mythology the word *demon* had a rather peculiar history, or development of meaning. As Homer used the term, it was almost, if not altogether, equivalent to the word *god* or *deity.* Hesiod, however, distinguished between *gods* and *demons.* According to his representation in his *Works and Days*, "the latter are invisible tenants "of earth, remnants of the once happy 'golden race' whom the Olympic gods "first made." "They are generically different from the gods, but essentially "good, and forming the intermediate agents and police between gods and "men." (Grote's *History of Greece*, vol. i, part i, 2, pp. 58, 60.) By and by, however, Empedocles and Xenocrates represented the ghosts of the 'silver race' as demons too; and, as the 'silver race' were "reckless and mischievous toward each other, and disdainful of the immortal gods," they made *bad demons.* This representation grew in the public mind, and at length overlapped the other, so that the word *demon* "came insensibly to convey with it a bad sense,—the idea of an evil being as contrasted with the goodness of a god." (Grote's *History*, vol. i, part i, 2, 16, pp. 61, 348, 349.) It was at this ultimate stage of the word's history that it got into use among the Greek-speaking Jews; and hence, in New Testament usage, it denotes *an evil spirit, of an order of beings superior in knowledge and power to men.* In short it was regarded as a fitting Greek designation for *a fallen angel.*—As to the possibility and probability of possession, see on ver. 23. When the evangelist says that the people brought '*all*' *the diseased and the demoniac*, the *all* is to be interpreted in accordance with the way in which it is often freely used in popular parlance. Compare *vv.* 5, 33, 37.

Ver. 33. *And the whole city was gathered together at the door*:–They came *to the door*, (πρὸς τὴν θύραν), and were thus *at the door*, crowding around it. *The whole city* thus came, that is, *the whole body of the citizens.* The evangelist is speaking popularly in his use of the word *whole;* and Capernaum, we must bear in mind, would be but a small city or town. (Compare the use of πόλις and κώμη in Luke ii, 4 and John vii, 42.) Dr. Samuel Clarke's paraphrase of the verse is, "*And such a vast multitude of people gathered together about the house, to see what was done, that almost the whole city seemed to be there.*"

Ver. 34. *And he cured many sufferers from various diseases; and many*

sick of divers diseases, and cast out many devils; and suffered not the devils [3]to speak, because they knew him.

35 And [k]in the morning, rising up a great while before day, he went out, and departed into a [l]solitary place, and there prayed. 36 And Simon and they that were with him followed after him.

[3] Or, *to say that they knew him.*

[k] Lu. 4. 42.

[l] Mat. 14. 23.

---

*demons he cast out*:—The evangelist distinguishes between natural diseases and demoniacal possessions; though, not unlikely, the line that separated them would not be very rigidly drawn.———*And he suffered not the demons to speak, for they knew him*: Beza, overlooking the proper import of the word rendered *speak*, (λαλεῖν), renders the clause thus, *and he suffered not the demons to say that they knew him.* The demons knew him to be the Messiah, and were ready, in their anguish and anger, to address him as such. (See *v.* 24. Compare Matt. viii, 29.) But Jesus did not wish to be borne onward in his career by the aid of their testimony. See on *vv.* 24, 25.

Ver. 35. *And in the morning, while it was very dark, he rose up, and went out*:—Namely, from the house where he was lodging. The expression in our Authorized Translation, *a great while before day*, brings into view a length of time which is not indicated in the original phraseology, (πρωῒ ἔννυχα λίαν), and which might with difficulty be harmonized with the expression in Luke iv, 42. Coverdale, following Luther, errs on the other hand in omitting to translate the adverb which intensifies the idea of the *nocturnality*, as it were, or the existing *darkness*. His translation is, *in the mornynge before daye.* Even the expression *before day* is not quite precise. *Before daylight* would be better. (Luke iv, 42.) The original expression is a plural adverb, in the accusative form, meaning literally, when combined with the intensive adverb, *while it was exceedingly nocturnal*, that is, *while the darkness of the departing night was still very great.* (See ἔννυχον in 3 Macc. v, 5, which Kypke translates *exeunte nocte.*) The morning is not a mere *point*, but a *line* of time, an elongated progress or procession. At the one extremity it is *in the night;* at the other it is *in the day.* Wycliffe's version is admirable, *in the morewynge ful erly.*——— *And departed into a desert place, and was there praying*:—Instead of "*desert* place," our Authorized Version has "*solitary* place,"—the only instance in which the evangelist's adjective is so rendered. It means, however, more than *solitary*, for a garden or a grain-growing field might be solitary, especially in the early morning. Indeed Matthew Henry actually supposes that the reference here might be to "some remote garden or outbuilding." It is a mistake however. The word in all other places is rendered either *desert* or *desolate.* Our Saviour went to one of the bare and barren spots stretching away north or west from Capernaum. He was engaged *in praying*, or *in lifting up his spirit communingly to his Heavenly Father.* The word rendered *was praying* (προσηύχετο) does not simply denote *asking.* "Prayer," says Petter, "is a holy conference with God."

Ver. 36. *And Simon and his companions went in pursuit of him*:—When they awoke in the morning and found him gone, they seem to have got alarmed lest he should have left them, betaking himself to some other sphere of

37 And when they had found him, they said unto him, All *men* seek for thee. 38 And he said unto them, Let us go into the next towns, that I may preach there also:

---

labour. So too the inhabitants of the little city in general seem to have felt. Hence the haste and eagerness of Simon and his companions—(Andrew, James, and John, see *v.* 38),—as indicated by the strong verb employed, (κατεδίωξεν); they *pursued him*, as if *he were fleeing from them.* The Syriac Peshito version softens the evangelist's phrase, using a verb which simply means *sought.* They *went in quest of him.* But the Philoxenian Syriac adheres to the literal idea, using a verb and preposition which mean *pursued after.* Peter was the leader of the pursuing party,—thus giving early indication of the impulsive ardour of his nature.

VER. 37. *And when they found him, they say to him*:–Or, as Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Alford read the expression, *And they found him, and say to him,* (καὶ εὗρον αὐτόν καὶ λέγουσιν). So ℵ B L and the Æthiopic version.———*All seek thee*:–That is, though indefinitely, *all the people (in Capernaum).* The people in general had no sooner risen in the morning than they thought of the wonderful preacher and healer and demon-expeller. They wanted still to hear more, and to see more; and hence they came, one after another, to the house where he had been lodging, in quest of him. His popularity had leaped up instantaneously to the superlative degree. In the original expression, *all seek thee,* as it stands in the "Received Text," (πάντες ζητοῦσίν σε), the emphasis is on the word *seek.* The Alexandrine manuscript, however, and many others, put the pronoun before the verb, as if the *thee* were to be emphasized. Griesbach and Fritzsche approve of that position of the pronoun. Bishop Wordsworth too, who hence says that the *thee* is emphatic. "*Thou* art the object of their search." But this is evidently a misplacing of the emphasis; and the best editors and manuscripts (ℵ B C D L Δ, 1, 33) support the order of the Received Text.

VER. 38. *And he says to them, Let us go elsewhere*:–This word *elsewhere* (ἀλλαχοῦ) is inserted by Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, Candy. It is found in the Sinaitic, Vatican, and Ephraemi manuscripts, (ℵ B C*), and L, and 33—"the queen of the cursives," and in the Coptic, Armenian, Æthiopic, and Arabic versions. It brings out generically what is specifically expressed in the following clause.———*Into the next towns*:–The smaller places round about,—*the adjoining towns and villages.* The compound word (κωμοπόλεις) translated in our Authorized Version *towns* means *village-cities* as it were, or *village-towns* as Petter renders it, *country-towns* as Cajetan explains it. It is a word that occurs only here in the New Testament. Strabo however uses it; and it is common in the Byzantine medieval writers. It would include, as employed by the evangelist, imperfectly enclosed towns, and unenclosed *villages* or *hamlets* (Thucyd. i, 5), where however there would be some synagogue or place of social worship. (See next verse, and compare Lightfoot *in loc.*) There were many such towns and villages in Galilee. Josephus says concerning the two Galilees,—upper and lower,—"The cities (πόλεις) lie thick, and the multitudes of villages (κωμῶν) are everywhere so full of people, in consequence of the richness of the soil,

for [m]therefore [n]came I forth. 39 [o]And he preached in their synagogues throughout all Galilee, and cast out devils.

40 [p]And there came a leper to him, beseeching

[m] Isai. 61. 1.
[n] John 16. 28.
[o] Mat. 4. 23.
[p] Mat. 8. 2. Lu. 5. 12.

---

that the very least of them contains above fifteen thousand inhabitants." (*War*, iii. 3. 2.)———*That I may preach there also; for to this end came I forth*:—*To this end*, that is, that I may preach the good news, not in one place only, but far and wide amongst the lost sheep of the house of Israel. The Saviour came forth from his invisible condition into the world, *to this end*. Not indeed *to this end* only. He had other ends in view, higher still. But this was one of the aims which actuated him. The expression *came I forth* or *came I out* was probably used by our Saviour with intentional indefiniteness. He does not specify whence or from whom he came. The truth was left to dawn gradually upon the disciples' minds. He *came into the world;* he *came out* into it;—*out* from beyond, or from above. *He came out from the Father.* See John viii, 42; xiii, 3; xvi, 27, 28, 30; and compare Hegendorphinus *in loc.* Compare also Matt. xiii, 49, where we read that "the angels *shall come forth* (or *shall come out*), and sever the wicked from among the just." See Luke iv, 43. De Wette thinks that the expression means *for to this end came I out (from Capernaum).* Meyer insists on the same view,—*for to this end came I out (of the house).* So Fritzsche,—*for to this end came I out (into this desert place).* Godwin too. Such an interpretation, however, amazes us. It involves a sudden, arbitrary, and most unpleasant descent into bathos. It is to assume, moreover, that our Lord had resolved, as if in caprice, to go off elsewhere without his newly-called disciples, and without so much as even informing them of his intended movement! It is to assume, besides, that it is not likely that our Saviour would wish to quicken thought by occasionally using two-edged expressions, which would lead his hearers to think at one and the same time of a lower and a higher relationship of things,—a most improbable assumption.

VER. 39. *And he preached in their synagogues throughout all Galilee, and cast out devils*:-A simple and very easily understood historical statement, but, in the original, thrown very inartificially together, as in a heap of phraseology. If the correct reading were literally rendered, it would run thus,—*And he came preaching into their synagogues, into the whole of Galilee, and casting out the demons,* (καὶ ἦλθεν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν εἰς ὅλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐκβάλλων). The reading '*into*' *their synagogues* is overwhelmingly supported by the manuscripts of importance. And the introductory expression *he came* is supported by the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts, (ℵ B), as well as by L, and the Coptic and Æthiopic versions. It is received into the text by Tischendorf (in his 8th edition), and by Tregelles. The "Received Text" has apparently been touched into harmony with the text of Luke (iv, 44).—*Throughout all Galilee*:-Josephus says that in his day there were "two hundred and forty towns and villages in Galilee." (*Life*, §. 45.)

VER. 40. *And there comes to him a leper*:-We know not in what place. Luke says it was "in one of the cities," (see chap. v, 12—16). Matthew too records the miracle, (viii, 1—4), but does not specify the place. To this day

him, and kneeling down to him, and saying unto him, If

---

lepers' quarters are found outside the walls of many of the towns of Palestine. (Tristram's *Land of Israel*, p. 417.)—*A leper* :–One infected with what Mead calls "the most dreadful of all the diseases to which the Jews were subject," *(atrocissimus erat, qui Judæorum corpora frequenter fædabat, morbus.* –Medica Sacra, cap. 2). Many diseases have their peculiar haunts or habitats; and leprosy seems to have been emphatically, and as existing under some peculiarly aggravated type or phase, a Syrian, Arabian, and Egyptian disease. (See Smith's *Bible Dictionary*, sub voce.) Perhaps the Jews brought it from Egypt, which Lucretius (*Rerum Nat.* vi, 1112—3), and other ancient writers (see *J. Mason Good's note on Lucretius)*, assert to be the birth-place and the favourite abode of *elephantiasis.* It is disputed, indeed, among nosologists whether or not *elephantiasis* be really *leprosy.* The dispute is to a great degree a matter of terminology. (See J. Mason Good's *Study of Medicine*, vol. ii, pp. 851—862, and vol. iv, p. 578.) But it seems to be certain that what is, at the present day, regarded as *leprosy* in Jerusalem, and throughout Palestine and Syria, is not so much the disease which the old Greek and Latin physicians called *leprosy*, as the still more loathsome malady called *elephantiasis.* Diseases, indeed, sometimes vary in their development, in the course of ages. They culminate and wane. They run out their course, or pass into new varieties. (See Hecker's *Epidemics of the middle ages.)* Whether or not this may have been the case with the old Jewish leprosy we need not at present inquire. Dr. Robinson says,—"Within the Zion gate of Jerusalem "a little towards the right, are some miserable hovels, inhabited by persons "called leprous. Whether their disease is or is not the leprosy of Scripture, "I am unable to affirm; the symptoms described to us were similar to those "of elephantiasis. At any rate they are pitiable objects, and miserable "outcasts from society. They all live here together, and intermarry only with "each other." *(Biblical Researches*, vol. i, 359.) We ourselves saw the poor creatures, and noted the erosive and dismembering nature of their malady. The disease riots tubercularly and ulceratingly, attacking and destroying feature after feature of the face, and the fingers and the toes, and other parts, till "the patient becomes a hideous spectacle, and falls in pieces." (See Michaelis's *Mosaisches-Recht*, §§. 208, 209.)———*Beseeching him, and kneeling down to him, and saying unto him, If thou willest, thou art able to cleanse me* :–The disease was correctly regarded, not only as constituting a ceremonial uncleanness, but also as embodying a real physical impurity. Hence when the leper applied to the Saviour for cleansing, he had no reference to ceremonial purification, which a priest alone could confer. He had exclusive reference to physical purification, which would consist in restoration to such a normal state of health, as, when acknowledged by the priest, would be his passport into the privilege of living in communion with the population at large, as an admitted member of society. When he said to our Lord, *Thou art able to cleanse me*, he manifested, as Alexander remarks, a very high degree of faith in our Lord's divine or messianic power. Leprosy stood apart by itself from all other diseases, as a malady that signally manifested the judicial displeasure of God. (See 2 Kin. v, 27; 2 Chron. xxvi,

thou wilt, thou canst make me clean. 41 And Jesus, moved with compassion, put forth *his* hand, and touched him, and saith unto him, I will; be thou clean. 42 And [q]as soon as he had spoken, immediately the leprosy departed from him, and he was cleansed. 43 And he straitly charged

[q] Psa. 33. 9.

---

19—21.) It was admitted to be in general incurable. When the afflicted man said, *If thou wilt*, he admitted that he did not know whether it might be within the range of our Lord's mission, or within the scope of his aim and intent, to grant relief to such a humiliated and outcast class of sufferers as that to which he belonged. *We* know: but *he* did not.

VER. 41. *And Jesus, moved with compassion*:—An exceedingly fine translation, (σπλαγχνισθείς), far excelling the renderings of all the older English versions. ———*Put forth his hand, and touched him*:—The evangelist pictures the act, and you see it. The Saviour did not fear contamination from contact with the leper; and surely, if it was competent to the priest, in administering ceremonial purification, to touch the healed patient, (see Lev. xiv), much more was it competent to our Lord, and a becoming thing, when imparting real purification, to touch lovingly and sympathetically the patient whom it was his pleasure to heal. He was, as Hegendorphinus says, *the Lord of the law, (dominus legis)*. The touch would be moreover, at once to the patient himself, and to the onlookers, an optical indication and demonstration of the actual transit of the healing virtue from the curer to the cured. ———*And saith unto him, I will, be thou cleansed*:—He spoke with sublime fiat, calmly and collectedly, and in the full self-consciousness of his perfect power.

VER. 42. *And immediately*:—The intervening words *as soon as he had spoken*, which are found in the Received Text, seem to have been an old marginal amplification. They are wanting in the manuscripts ℵ B D L, 16, 69, and in many of the manuscripts of the Old Latin version, (*a*, *b*, *c*, *e*, *ff*$^{2}$, *g*$^{1}$); in the Coptic version too, and the Syriac Peshito. They are omitted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Candy. ———*The leprosy departed from him, and he was cleansed*:—The cure was instantaneous and complete. It would be a grand spectacle, and fitted to arouse, to the highest pitch, enthusiasm and expectation in the onlookers. Wakefield, misapprehending the bearing of Matthew's expression (viii, 3) on the phraseology of Mark, translates the clause, absurdly enough, thus—*the leprosy went from the man and was cleansed.*

VER. 43. *And he straitly charged him*:—The Evangelist's word is a very strong one (ἐμβριμησάμενος), and was originally employed to denote, onomatopoetically, the murmur, or mutter, or rumble-grumble, or growl of discontented chafed or fretted beasts or persons. (Compare the kindred Latin word *fremo*.) As here used it indicates that the Saviour spoke to the man peremptorily, and with a kind of unmistakeable sternness in his tone. The man would doubtless need to be thus addressed. Not unlikely he would be far too demonstrative in his gratitude, and going beyond bounds at once in his words and in his actions. Perhaps, forgetting himself, and losing sight of the fact that he was still ceremonially unclean, and must continue so until the priest should examine him and pronounce him to be clean, he may have prostrated himself and clasped the feet of our Lord, or he may have

him, and forthwith sent him away; 44 and saith unto
him, See thou say nothing to any man: but go thy way,
shew thyself to the priest, and [r]offer for thy cleans- [r] Lev. 14.
ing those things which Moses commanded, for a testimony

---

pushed himself too near the person of our Lord, or too near the persons of those who were surrounding our Lord. Hence he might require to be somewhat sternly repressed. Young renders the expression, *sternly charged him.* Mace, *severely charging him.* Wycliffe's translation is *thretenyde to hym,* that is, *threatened him.* Coverdale's is, *forbad him strately.* In Cranmer's Bible the clause is omitted altogether. Comp. Matt. ix, 30.———*And forthwith sent him away*:–Or, *and immediately dismissed him.* The original expression, in this clause too, is strong. It is literally, *and immediately threw him out,* (ἐξέβαλεν αὐτόν). Wycliffe's version is good, *and anoon he putte hym out.* Our Saviour probably required to be exceedingly peremptory with the man, giving him to understand that it would be abusing the grace that had been showed him, were he to come, just as he was, in contact with the persons of others, or to persist in a premature and unauthorized attempt to attach himself to his deliverer as one of his personal attendants.

Ver. 44. *And saith to him, See thou say nothing to any one*:–Literally, *to no one,* an instance of the double negative. The Saviour's fame as an exorcist and healer had already got wind enough,—and more than enough. It was in danger of blowing into a perfect hurricane of popularity. A check was therefore needed. There was a tendency to attach too much importance to the merely physical element of the work in which he was engaged. The far more important moral and spiritual elements were scarcely at all apprehended. Hence confusion in the minds and hearts of the people. Speedily, very likely, would they begin to weary waiting for the tide of events. They would seek to precipitate results. *Was not this the long-looked-for Deliverer? Is he not the true Messiah? Should we not have him instantly enthroned?* (John vi, 15.) *If we had him but once crowned, he would put all things to rights in the nation, and in all other nations too! The sooner, surely, the better!* It was thus no wonder that the Saviour said to the enthusiastic person before him, *See thou say nothing to any one.* His injunction shows us that certain truths may be unseasonably and prematurely promulgated. "God," says Petter, "is sometimes glorified by a discreet concealment of some truth for a time, as well as by the bold and constant confession of it at other times." A moral preparation is not infrequently needed to pave the way for the enunciation or publication of certain deep-drawing truths, which, without that preparation, would be misunderstood and misapplied. The transit from the esoteric to the exoteric must be wisely timed and tended.———*But go thy way*:–Or, *go away.* So the word is rendered in John vi, 67; xiv, 28. It is also sometimes rendered, *depart;* and often simply, *go.* It is rendered *yet thee hence* in Matt. iv, 10,—the rendering of Tyndale and the Geneva in the passage before us. ———*Shew thyself to the priest*:–Namely, in Jerusalem, that he may professionally examine thee, and authoritatively pronounce thee clean. See Lev. xiii, and xiv.———*And offer for thy cleansing what things Moses enjoined*:–These are specified in Lev. xiv, 1—32.—*Offer*:–or *present,* as the word is

unto them. 45 But he went out, and began to publish *it* much, and to blaze abroad the matter, insomuch that Jesus could no more openly enter into the city, but was without

---

rendered in Matt. ii, 11. The things were to be presented through the priest unto God, as an acknowledgement of the grace of God.—*For thy cleansing* :–That is, *for the sake of thy (ceremonial) cleansing.* See Lev. xiv, 14. The expression is literally, *concerning thy cleansing*, or still more literally, *about*—or *round about—thy cleansing*, (περί). The ceremonial cleansing of the man is regarded as the *central* object contemplated in the entire circle of the ceremonies that required to be observed.———*For a testimony to them* :–Act thus, in order that the officiating priest, and the other officials who are associated with him, may learn from them the facts that are transpiring in Galilee. These facts have an important bearing upon the fulness of the time, and the fulfilment of the Scriptures.

Ver. 45. *But he went out* :–From where? Fritzsche and Meyer say from *the house* where the miracle had been wrought. So Patritius. But it is not certain that the miracle had been wrought in a house. It might have been difficult for a leper,—contact with whom occasioned uncleanness,—to get into any house where our Saviour was likely to be. It is therefore enough for us to say, with Maldonato, that *the leper went out* from the place where the cure had been effected, and thus, as Volkmar puts it, from the circle of people who were round about the Saviour.———*And began to publish (it) much* :–It is better to leave out the supplementary *it*, and to carry forward the reference of the verb, to the noun that is specified in the immediately succeeding clause. So Grimm. The adverbial word, translated *much*, is plural in the original, (πολλά). It is rendered *many things* by Tyndale and in the Geneva version; and it is strangely rendered *in many places* by Godwin. It just means *much*, however,—the quantitative idea going naturally over into the qualitative or intensive. Compare Mark iii, 12; v, 10, 23, 43; ix, 26; Rom. xvi, 6, 12; 1 Cor. xvi, 12. Elsner would translate the word *vehemently*, (*vehementer*). When the Evangelist says that the man "*began* to publish much," he draws our attention, graphically, to the commencement of his career, and then leaves the continuation of it to go off, under our eyes as it were, into the unseen.———*And to blaze abroad the matter* :–Or rather, *the account* (viz. of the matter). The expression *blaze abroad* is a happy and striking translation, (διαφημίζειν). Our translators got it from the Rheims. Wycliffe gives a duplicate version, "diffame *(or puplishe).*"———*So that he*—our Authorized version, after Tyndale, replaces the pronoun with the name *Jesus*, for the sake of perspicuity,—*insomuch that Jesus was no longer able to enter openly into a city* :–*Into a city*, not *into the city*, as in our Authorized version, and the preceding English versions, and Luther too. The meaning is *into any city*, as Rilliet renders it (*dans aucune ville*). So too Patritius. The literal translation would be *into town;* only, this phrase had not quite the same idiomatic import among the Greeks, that it has in English. *Into towns* would bring out the idea intended. Jesus, says the Evangelist, *was not able* to enter openly into towns. The language is popular. The inability was, as metaphysicians would say, not physical but moral; not

in desert places: and [s]they came to him from every quarter. [s] Chap. 2. 13.

## CHAPTER II.

*Jesus returns to Capernaum, and the people crowd after him,* 1, 2. *A paralytic is let down through the roof of the house where he was teaching. Jesus forgives and heals him,* 3—12. *He went out by the side of the lake, and called Levi from his customs' office to follow him,* 13, 14. *Levi entertained him at a feast. But the scribes and Pharisees censoriously judge him for eating with publicans and sinners,* 15, 16. *Jesus defends his conduct,* 17. *He also explains why his disciples did not join the disciples of John and of the Pharisees in fasting,* 18—22. *He defends his disciples for plucking and eating ears of corn on the Sabbath day,* 23—28.

AND again he entered [a]into Capernaum after [a] Mat. 9. 1.

---

absolute, but upon a condition. Our Lord was unable, in consistency with the high moral and spiritual aims which he had in view. He was unable, because the moment that his presence was recognized in a town, he was liable to be surrounded and hemmed in by a surging crowd of ignorant, and ignorantly expectant, gazers wonderers and volunteer-followers. One sees now how wise it was to tell the leper to hold his tongue.—The phrase *no longer*, in the expression *he was no longer able to enter into towns*, has reference to the particular period spoken of. It was a period that continued only for a limited season. See chap. ii, 1.———*But was without in desert places*:—Now here and now there. He *was* in these places *continuously*, (ἦν). He *continued* in them. *Without*:—out of town, out of towns.———*And they came to him from all parts*:—The people *kept coming* to him, (ἤρχοντο), notwithstanding the difficulty of reaching him, and the inconveniences connected with a sojourn, even for a very limited period, in an unpopulated district.

## CHAPTER II.

So far as Chapter I carries us into the career of our Lord, we find him pursued by a most inconvenient amount of popular enthusiasm and curiosity. The whole district of Galilee was heaving and ringing with excitement concerning him. *Is this 'He'? Who else can it be? Surely it must be 'He'! The day at length is dawning! Soon shall the Romans be put down! Soon shall God's people be exalted! The kingdom of heaven is at hand! Is not this the Son of David, and the King of the kingdom, though in disguise?* His fame thrilled almost instantaneously all over the region, and ran along vibrating chords into the surrounding localities.

These were the beginnings of things. But other elements soon sprang up.

*some* days; and it was noised that he was in the house.

---

When once both high and low were fairly waked up into interest, and were straining their minds to comprehend 'who this should be,' the ecclesiastical formalists and critics found multitudes of things, both in our Lord's words and works, which did not fit into the angles of their preconceived notions. Hence came collision;—and this collision grew, and grew, till Christ was crucified, and Judaism was shivered into pieces, and a new spiritual constitution of things was inaugurated. The first shocks of collision are exhibited in a variety of scenes, which are consecutively depicted from the beginning of this second chapter, down to the sixth verse of the third. Had the chapters been more skilfully bounded off by Hugo de Sancto Caro, the second would have extended over the first six verses of the third.

The scene that is depicted in Chapter ii, 1—12 is also depicted by Matthew, chapter ix, 1—8, and by Luke, v, 17—26. Michelsen contends that the paragraph bears marks of an overhauling, by the Deutero-Markus, of the original narrative of the Proto-Markus. (*Het Evangelie van Markus*, pp. 88—90.) It is, however, an entirely arbitrary supposition. The paragraph only bears marks of a plurality of subjective factors in the mind and memory of the one Mark.

VER. 1. *And when he entered again into Capernaum after a lapse of days, it was reported 'He is into (the) house'*: Such is the connection of the two clauses of the verse, according to the correct reading,—that of ℵ B D L, 33, and the Coptic, Armenian, and Æthiopic versions, (εἰσελθὼν.....ἠκούσθη, not εἰσῆλθεν .....καὶ ἠκούσθη). It is the reading of Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Alford; and approved by Meyer.———*After a lapse of days*:—Or, *after a time*. Literally, *through days*, that is, *(passing) through days*. Tyndale's version is, *after a feawe dayes*. Coverdale's, *after certayne dayes*. (See L. Bos. *Exercitat. Phil.* in loc.)———*It was reported*:—Literally, *it was heard*. So Wycliffe,—only he has it in the present tense, *it is herd*. Every report is two-sided. It is something *said* and something *heard*. The English phrase exhibits the one side of the reality, the Greek the other.———*That he was in the house*: Such is the free translation of our Authorized Version. The demonstrative particle *that*, however, is "recitative" in the original. It introduces the citation of the report heard, in the "direct" form of reporting: and hence the verb, in the original, is in the present tense, *he is*, not *he was*. Hence too the *that* is superfluous in English, as being in our idiom the introductory formula of an "indirect" report.—*It was heard, 'He is in the house'*:—or, more literally, *'He is into the house,'* or more literally still, *'He is into house,'* (εἰς οἶκόν ἐστιν). None of the three translations, however, does full justice to the original idiom. So far as the preposition *into* is concerned, we may retain it,—usage, in some places at least, allowing it. It indicates the *motion* that preceded the *rest*. *He has gone 'into' the house, and is 'in' it.* But we cannot say *into house*, as the Germans say *zu Hause* or *nach Hause;* and yet our phrase *into the house* points, as a phrase, determinately to some particular house,—an idea that is not phraseologically involved in the Greek expression. Of course, the Saviour was in some particular house, most probably Peter's; but the evangelist's phrase does not bring out this fact into prominence. It indicates more, how-

2 And straightway many were gathered together, insomuch that there was no room to receive *them,* no, not so much as about the door: and he [b]preached the word [b] Psa. 22. 22. Psa. 40. 9.

---

ever, than would be indicated by our expression, *He is into a house.* His meaning very much accords with our English idiomatic expression *in town,* or *into town,* only instead of the generic idea of *town,* we have the specific idea of *house.* If our idiom would have allowed us to say *in house* or *into house,* as we say *in town* or *into town,* there would have been a perfect correspondence between the English and Greek expressions. *Into town* does not mean *into a town,* and hence Wycliffe's, Tyndale's, and Godwin's translation ("in a house"), and Euthymius Zigabenus's interpretation (εἰς οἰκόν τινα), are wrong.—Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Candy, suppose that the original expression is *in house,* (ἐν οἴκῳ), instead of *into house* (εἰς οἶκον). They have the authority of the important manuscripts ℵ B D L, 33; but, as the reading of the Received Text is obviously the more rugged, and, in some respect, the more difficult of the two, it is to be presumed that it would be the original. Hence Meyer, Lange, Alford retain it. A transcriber might readily turn the more rugged phrase into the smoother, thinking that he was doing no harm; but it is more difficult to imagine that he would wilfully transmute a smooth, correct, and easy-going reading into one that was rugged and peculiar. The Alexandrine manuscript (A), and the Ephraemi (C), and the rest of the uncials, with the exception of ℵ B D L, read *into,* not *in.*

VER. 2. *And straightway* :–Lachmann and Tregelles query the genuineness of this *straightway* or *immediately;* and Tischendorf throws it out, in his 8th edition. Bengel too was in doubt about it; and Mill condemned it as "irreptitious," (p. clii). It is omitted by the manuscripts ℵ B L, 33, and by the Vulgate, Coptic, Syriac Peshito, Armenian, and Æthiopic versions. The word is a favourite with Mark, (see chap. i, 21), and seems to drop down very naturally into the expression before us. But for this very reason, it is more likely that it would be added, than that it would be subtracted, by transcribers. ———*Many were gathered together* :–Entering with oriental freedom into the house where the Saviour was. It would be a humble house, and the public apartment, or family-room, in which our Saviour would be seated, was soon crowded to the door. ———*Insomuch that there was no room to receive (them), no, not so much as about the door* :–A somewhat periphrastic translation, handed down from Tyndale, but with the omission of one of Tyndale's important words,—*now* after *insomuch that.* Rowlandson's translation is good, "*so that no longer did even the parts about the door afford room;*" or, without the "*did,*" it might be rendered thus,—*so that even the parts about the door no longer afford room, (let alone the space within the house).* The Evangelist, as the Germans would say, *presentiates* the scene. He makes us spectators of it, *as if we were present, and looking on.* We see the public room rapidly filling up, till it is crowded to the door. The people, however, still come flocking toward the door (πρὸς τὴν θύραν) and choke up the whole space around, till there is no longer (μηκέτι) room. Those who are outside stretch their necks eagerly to get a glimpse of the Rabbi, or to catch something that he says. ———*And he spake*

unto them. 3 [c]And they come unto him, bringing one sick of the palsy, which was borne of four. 4 And when they could not come nigh unto him for the

[c] Mat. 9. 2. Lu. 5. 18.

---

*to them the word*:—*The word*, in the collective import of the term, the import which it bears when the reference is to *vocables 'laid' in order*, (λόγος from λέγω. Compare the Latin *lego* and the Anglo-Saxon *lecgan*. Compare also the Latin *sermo*). It is some particular *word* that is referred to,—"*the* word." It was what Luke and Paul so often call *the word of God*. It was no doubt *the word of truth, the word of the truth of the gospel* (Colossians i, 5), *the word of the Kingdom* (Matthew xiii, 19), *the 'good-spell' regarding the kingdom of heaven*. Our Saviour *spake the word*:—Note the term *spake*, or *was speaking*. It is in the imperfect tense, and intimates that he was engaged in speaking when the occurrence just about to be narrated took place. The term *preached* employed in our Authorized Version summons up before our imagination more of the nature of *a public proclamation* or *harangue*, than is indicated by the evangelist's expression. The Saviour was in a private house, and sat *talking* to the people. Such is the import of the term, (ἐλάλει). It is almost always rendered *speak* in our version, sometimes *talk* (or *say* or *utter*), never *preach* except here and in four or five places in the *Acts of the Apostles*, and in all of these it would be better to render it *speak*.

VER. 3. *And there come to him (persons) bringing a paralytic borne by four*:—Instead of *there come to him (persons) bringing a paralytic*, the manuscripts ℵ B L and 33 read *there come (persons) bringing to him a paralytic*, (ἔρχονται φέροντες πρὸς αὐτὸν παραλυτικόν). It has the appearance of being an artificially improved reading,—a reading made smoother by a slight transposition of the words *to him*. As a matter of fact the persons referred to *were 'bringing to Jesus'* the paralytic. As a matter of fact *they do not come into the actual presence of Jesus*, till after a considerable time has elapsed, and very considerable obstacles have been overcome. Hence it is probable that the easier reading of ℵ B L and 33 should not be received; as it is not likely that the *transposition* would be made from an easier *position* to a more difficult. The whole texture of the verse is inartificial and rugged; but yet abundantly perspicuous. And it is right to note that the expression *to him* does not necessarily mean *up to him* or *into his immediate presence*. The preposition denotes, as Webster says (*Gram.* p. 183), "the direction of motion." Hence the saying of our Lord in John xii, 32, "and I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men *unto me*." The direction of the drawing, rather than the accomplished result, is indicated.—*Borne of four*:—He would be suspended on his bed, pallet, or mat, between two pairs of bearers. A bearer would have hold of each corner.

VER. 4. *And when they could not come nigh unto him*: The Vulgate version is, *And when they could not present (him) to him.* It represents a very ancient reading, (προσενέγκαι instead of προσεγγίσαι), the reading of ℵ B L, 33, and also of the Philoxenian Syriac, and the Coptic, and Æthiopic versions. It has been taken into the text by Tischendorf in his 8th edition. Ewald accepts it. Certainly it seems to be the more difficult reading of the two, as there is no noun or pronoun to represent the person whom they wished to lay before the

press, they uncovered the roof where he was: and when they

---

Lord. Volkmar, however, thinks that it has arisen from comparing the expression in Luke v, 18. Unlikely. The reading of the Received Text runs smoother, and would not be so likely to be voluntarily modified on the one hand, or unintentionally misread on the other in a somewhat carelessly written manuscript. The variation is a matter of no exegetical moment.——*For the press*:–Literally, *because of the multitude*, as the word is generally rendered, or, *because of the crowd.*——*They uncovered the roof where he was*:–Very literally, *they unroofed the roof where he was.* They undid the roofing at the spot which was right in front of the place where he was sitting. Purvey has a picturesque translation, *thei unheeliden the roof*,—the verb *to heel* or *hool* meaning originally *to cover.* (The *heel* is a peculiarly covered spot of the body. He who is *healed* is *recovered.*) The Gothic version is not unlike Purvey's, *andhulidedun hrot.* As to the *hrot* or *roof*, which was partially uncovered, Dr. Shaw, the traveller, supposed it to be the awning that is sometimes drawn over the quadrangular court, around which larger houses are built. He supposed that our Saviour would be sitting and teaching in the court below, and that the bearers of the paralytic, leaning over the terrace of the house, would fold back a portion of the awning, and then let down (by ropes), not "through the tiles," but "*by the side* of the tiles," the couch of the patient. (*Travels in Barbary and the Levant*, vol. i, pp. 381—6, *ed.* 1808.) The supposition, when laid hold of by the imagination, forms itself readily into an interesting picture. But it is too romantic, and invested with too much "pomp of circumstance." It proceeds on the assumption that our Saviour *was in a great house*, where there was ample accommodation, and many of the appliances of luxury. Dr. Kitto modifies, and in some respect exaggerates, Dr. Shaw's conception. He supposes with Dr. Shaw, that the people were gathered together in the quadrangular court of a great house; but he thinks it probable that Jesus, instead of sitting in the midst of the people in the court, was occupying a commanding position in the gallery or verandah that ran round the second story of the house. "The roofing of this gallery "was distinct from that of the house,"—"it is of very slight construction." "We think, therefore, that the men having mounted to the terraced roof, "proceeded to remove a part of this light roofing of the gallery, over the place "where Jesus sat below." Webster and Wilkinson adopt what is substantially Dr. Kitto's view. Bishop Wordsworth too. But it is inconsistent with the humble position in society of the occupants of the house; and it does violence, moreover, to the phraseology of the representation. Even the supposition of Lightfoot, Bland, Meyer, Bisping, and many others, that our Saviour must have been in an "upper room" is entirely arbitrary; and improbable too;—more particularly improbable, when we take the crowding around the door into account. The house would doubtless be a very humble one,—a mere cottage. When Alexander says that "eastern houses are always built around an open court," he writes under an entire misapprehension. Such a mode of construction is indeed the prevailing style for the larger class of houses; *but for them only.* The cottages of the mass of the people, and especially in the villages and hamlets, are quite different, and are really

had broken *it* up, they let down the bed wherein the sick

---

very humble low-roofed, one-storied residences, opening directly, without any intervening porch or "lobby," into the street or pathway. Often they consist of but one apartment, though often there is an inner apartment; and in other cases there is a confused aggregation of subordinate apartments, stretching backward, and sometimes under distinct roofs, like cot attached to cot. With a little agility, and, if need be, with some simple appliance, far less elaborate than the application of a ladder, there would be no difficulty at all in getting on the flat roof of the fisherman's cottage. There would just be as little in undoing such a portion of the roofing as would be needed to admit of the descent of the paralytic on his couch. The flippant objections which have been persistently urged by Woolston (*Miracles*, iv, p. 57), Strauss (*Leben*, §. 92), Bruno Bauer (*Kritik*, §. 35), and other scoffers, are founded on an entire misconception of oriental house-construction, in the sphere of the humbler classes of society. See next clause.———*And when they had broken (it) up*:-Or, more literally, *and when they broke (it) up*. The word thus translated (ἐξορύξαντες) explains, more particularizingly, what it was which they did to the portion of the roof which they unroofed. They *dug it out*, or *scooped it out*. (See Gal. iv, 15; Matt. xxi, 33; xxv, 18; Mark xii, 1.) A more appropriate term could not have been selected, even by Thucydides or Xenophon. The roofs of the humble class of oriental houses are such that *digging* or *scooping* is necessary whenever there is the intent to effect an entrance. And such *digging* or *scooping* do no injury whatever to the fabric. Dr. Robinson, speaking of the district about Lebanon, says,—"The flat roofs "of the houses in this region are constructed by laying, first, large beams "at intervals of several feet; then rude joists; on which again are arranged "small poles close together, or brushwood; and upon this is spread earth "or gravel rolled hard. This rolling is often repeated, especially after rain; "for these roofs are apt to leak. For this purpose a roller of stone is kept "ready for use on the roof of every house. Grass is often seen growing on "these roofs." (*Later Researches*, p. 39.) Referring to his lodging in Jerjú'a, on the way between Beirut and 'Akka, he says,—"Like all the other "houses of the village, it had but one story." "The roof was of the usual "kind, supported by rude props. It rained heavily during the night; and "the water found its way through upon us. Quite early in the morning we "heard our host at work rolling the roof; and saw the same process going on "with other houses. Goats, also, were cropping the grass growing on several "roofs." (*Later Researches*, p. 44.) "We must banish from our minds," says Dr. W. M. Thomson, "every form of European or American houses." "All "that it is necessary for us to know is, that the roof was flat, low, easily "reached, and easily opened, so as to let down the couch of the sick man; "and all these points are rendered intelligible by an acquaintance with "modern houses in the villages of Palestine." (*The Land and the Book*, pp. 358, 359.) In some cases, says Dr. Thomson, stone slabs are laid across the joisting (p. 359); and in the case before us there had been slabs of tile or dried clay underneath the thick compost of earth and gravel. (See Luke v, 19.) The roofs of the houses in Palestine required, and require, to be

of the palsy lay. 5 When Jesus saw their [d]faith, he said unto the sick of the palsy, Son, [e]thy sins be forgiven thee. 6 But there were certain of the

[d] Mar. 9. 23. Acts 14. 9.
[e] Lu. 7. 48.

---

*thick* for the same reason that the people require to wear thick or manifolding turbans on their heads,—to keep out, as far as possible, the heat.———*They let down the bed on which the paralytic was lying* :—"Examine," says Dr. W. M. Thomson, "one of the houses of the modern villages in this same region, and "you will see at once that the thing is natural, and easy to be accomplished. "The roof is only a few feet high, and by stooping down, and holding the "corners of the couch—merely a thickly-padded quilt, as at present in this "region—they would let down the sick man without any apparatus of ropes "or cords to assist them." (*The Land and the Book*, p. 358.) When Woolston wildly depicts the danger of "a broken pate," incurred by our Lord and his disciples during the process, from "the falling of the tiles," he simply allows his flippancy to run riotous. The word translated *bed*, (κράβαττος—such is its correct form), was an unclassical term for a narrow couch or litter, on which only one person could lie. (It corresponded to the Attic σκίμπους. See *Phrynichus* in voc. and *Lobeck* in loc. p. 62.)

VER. 5. *And when Jesus saw their faith* :—The faith of the whole party, consisting of the paralytic himself and of his friends who had acted with him and for him. Jesus could look into their hearts and see ; and no doubt he did thus look. But at the same time their faith was signally manifested by their outward acts.———*He saith to the paralytic, Son, thy sins be forgiven thee* :—Or rather, *Thy sins have been forgiven.* The verb is in the indicative mood of the perfect passive, Doric form, (ἀφέωνται). If, however, we should adopt the reading of Tischendorf and Tregelles (ἀφίενται), the translation will be, *thy sins are forgiven.* If this latter reading be accepted, the Lord is represented as referring to a present occurrence, *Thy sins are forgiven* (viz. now). If the reading of the Received Text be retained, the Lord is represented as referring to a past occurrence, *Thy sins have been forgiven* (viz. *from the moment when thy faith began).* The Received reading has the support of a great majority of the important manuscripts. The other has the support of the Vatican manuscript, and of "the queen of the cursives" (33), and of the Syriac versions, and the Vulgate, and the Coptic. The *thee* at the conclusion of the clause should be omitted. It is wanting in ℵ B D (gr.) G L Δ, 1, 33, 69. The Lord, looking into the heart of the afflicted man, saw that he was more distressed on account of his sins than of his sickness ; and so he first of all spoke peace to his conscience. Not unlikely the young man had been foolish. Possibly he had brought his sickness upon himself by means of his sins. But he was now penitent, and a firm believer in the Messiah, —superadding to his general faith the specific conviction that the Messiah was before him in the person of Jesus. Jesus calls him *Son*, or, more literally, *child*, partly no doubt because he was young, but partly and principally, as we may believe, because there was a beautiful filial confidence in his heart.

VER. 6. *But there were certain of the scribes sitting there* :—They had scented heresy from afar, and had come to pry censoriously and inquisitorially into the teaching of the wonderful upstart Rabbi. See Luke v, 17. They "carried,"

scribes sitting there, and reasoning in their hearts, 7 Why doth this *man* thus speak blasphemies? who can [f]forgive sins but God only? 8 And immediately when Jesus [g]perceived in his spirit that they so reasoned within

[f] Psa. 130. 4. Isai. 43. 25. Dan. 9. 9.
[g] Lu. 7. 39, 40. John 6. 64. Rev. 2. 23.

---

says Trapp, "gall in their ears." On the word *scribes*, see Chapter i, 22. ———*And reasoning in their hearts*:–The reference of the expression *their hearts* is simply and generically to *the interior sphere* of their complex being, not specifically to the sphere of the affections. They *reasoned*:–The term is graphic in the original. They *started a dialogue with themselves* within their own minds, (διαλογιζόμενοι). *Themselves spoke to themselves*, as it were, but with bated breath.

VER. 7. *Why doth this (man) thus speak blasphemies?*–Or rather, according to the more graphic reading of Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, *why doth this (individual) thus speak? He blasphemes.* (τί οὗτος οὕτως λαλεῖ; βλασφημεῖ·) This reading is supported by the manuscripts ℵ B D L, and by the Vulgate version. The reading of the Received Text seems to have been conformed by some harmonist to the form of the expression in Luke (v, 21). *He blasphemes*:–He does an injury to the fame of God. He detracts from the reputation as it were, or from the true glory, of God. "Blasphemy," says Sir George Mackenzie, in his *Laws and Customs of Scotland in matters Criminal* (Tit. iii, §. 1), "is called in law, *divine lese Majesty* or *Treason;* and it is "committed either (1) by denying that of God, which belongs to him as one of "his attributes, or (2) by attributing to him that which is absurd, and incon-"sistent with his divine nature," or, as it may be added (3), by assuming to oneself, or ascribing to others, what is an incommunicable property or prerogative of God. It is with a reference to this third form of the crime that the word is used in the passage before us. See next clause.———*Who is able to forgive sins, except one–God?*–It is God's incommunicable prerogative to forgive sins,—to *dismiss* them from the sinner, as the original word signifies, (ἀφιέναι). Men may forgive trespasses that have been committed against themselves in so far as they are injuries done to themselves. But these trespasses, besides being injuries to men, are sins against God. So far, indeed, as they are sins at all, they are *relative only to God.* (Psalm li, 4.) None but He, therefore, can forgive them. In this fundamental idea the censorious scribes were right. But then in all other respects they were wrong. They were censoriously hypercritical in construing Christ's words as if he had said *I have forgiven thy sins*, or *I forgive thy sins.* Such was not his statement. For aught that the scribes could prove, he had merely *declared* the forgiveness of the poor man's sins. Then, in the second place, they were censoriously presumptuous in rushing to the conclusion that the wonderful Personage before them was not, and could not possibly be, "God manifest in flesh." Why not justly judge of him by his works, instead of censoriously criticising his mere words?

VER. 8. *And Jesus, having instantly perceived by his spirit that they are thus reasoning within themselves*:–He had an intuitive and divine perception of the contents of their hearts; and, by explicitly presenting these contents to their

themselves, he said unto them, Why reason ye these things in your hearts? 9 Whether is it easier to say to the sick

---

recognition, he implicitly rebuked them for their unwillingness to take cognizance of the supernatural element that was characterizing him. We may either say, on the one hand, "having instantly perceived *in his spirit*," or, on the other, "having instantly perceived *by his spirit*" (Le Clerc, Beausobre et L'Enfant), or *with his spirit* (Piscator, Heumann, Volkmar), or *through his spirit* (Bisping). The dative case employed may, in other words, denote either locality as it were (as "the *where* case"), or instrumentality (as "the *how* case"). It is not likely that the locality-idea is here intended; for, of course, perception or knowledge can never be localized anywhere but *in the spirit*, and there would therefore be no significancy in the specification. We should undoubtedly render the expression, *by his spirit*,—a rendering that brings into prominence *how*, or *in what way* or *by what means*, it was that our Lord read the hearts of his censors. It was not by what his ears heard or his eyes saw. It was not by means of any of those outward things that are objective to our percipient "senses." His knowledge did not reach him in that circuitous way, by the route of any of "the five gateways" in the periphery of the complex person. It was direct,—the knowledge of spirit by spirit. Wells translates the expression, *by his spirit*, and explains it as meaning *by his divine spirit*. Petter gives the same explanation, *by his divine nature*. Grotius contends at great length, and most learnedly, for the same explanation. So Euthymius Zigabenus, (πνεῦμα ἐνταῦθα τὴν θεότητα καλεῖ); and Erasmus (*Paraphrase*), and Calvin. Bengel also, and Calmet, and Rowlandson, and many others. Elsner, on the other hand, thinks that there is a reference to *the Holy Spirit*, which was given to our Lord without measure. The same view was taken by Wycliffe, who hence translates the expression, *by the Holy Goost*. Dionysius à Ryckel oscillates between the two interpretations, but tends toward the former. The reference to the Holy Spirit is altogether improbable. Neither is there any reason to believe that the evangelist was formally referring, in the spirit of a systematic theologian, to the divine nature of our Lord, as distinguished from the spiritual element of his human nature. He was not formulating to himself the distinction of the two natures, although it no doubt lay imbedded in his thoughts as the logical substrate of his representations. He simply makes reference, indefinitely and generically, to the inner and invisible or spiritual element of our Lord's complex being. In virtue of that element, and by means of it, our Lord saw at a glance through all interposing veils. He saw all things as they really were. All materialisms were transparent to him. So were all the spiritual inwrappings of things even in those hearts that were most coiled up and self-involved. He "needed not that any should testify of man; for he knew what was in man." (John ii, 25).———*He saith unto them, why reason ye these things in your hearts?—Why reason ye* (διαλογίζεσθε)? Why put questions and give answers to yourselves, in the way that ye are doing? *In your hearts*:—That is, *within yourselves*. See the preceding clause. It is as if he had said, *in your minds*, or, still more exactly, *in the heart of your beings*.

VER. 9. *Which is easier?—to say to the paralytic, 'Thy sins have been*

of the palsy. *Thy* sins be forgiven thee; or to say, Arise, and take up thy bed, and walk? 10 But that ye may know that the Son of man hath [h]power on earth to forgive

[h] John 17. 2.

---

*forgiven,' or to say, 'Arise, and take up thy couch and walk'?*—The Saviour, in the most felicitous manner imaginable, brings the case to the simplest of issues. There was no need for any long discussion. The whole matter could be settled by a few words. The inward could be certified by the outward, without any circumlocution. The upward could be reflected by the downward, immediately. The invisible could be manifested in the visible, just at once. And, if therefore it would be more satisfactory to them, or would carry more of the evidence of divine authority, he could speak a few words of fiat in reference to the visible and downward and outward; and he would do that just as easily as he had authoritatively said *Thy sins have been forgiven.* They might call in question his authority to say *Thy sins have been forgiven,* inasmuch as they could not actually see the dismissal of the sins. But if when he said, *Arise, take up thy couch and walk,* they could see with their eyes that the fiat was fulfilled, then surely they would have no just reason for calling in question the fulness of the divine authority, that was behind all that he was saying and doing. When the resources of divinity are available, it is just as easy to move a mountain as to remove a mole-hill,—to cancel the liabilities of a soul as to strike off the fetters of a body.———The Authorized Translation, *whether is it easier,* is not nearly so literal as Coverdale's, *whether is easier,* that is, *which of the two is easier.* Coverdale reproduces Luther's translation, (*welches ist leichter*).—In the editions of the original text that were lying before our translators, the *thy,* in the expression *(thy) sins be forgiven thee,* was wanting. It occurs, however, in the manuscripts ℵ B E F G H K L M U V Π, and in multitudes of the cursives, and the *thee* is omitted; *thy sins have been forgiven.* Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford have hence introduced the *thy* and left out the *thee.*———Instead of the word *walk,* or *walk about* (περιπάτει) at the close of the verse, Tischendorf reads *go thy way,* (ὕπαγε), under the authority of the Sinaitic manuscript (ℵ), and L Δ, &c. The Cambridge manuscript (D) and "the queen of the cursives" (33) read *go thy way to thy house.* Both the fuller reading, however, and the briefer seem to have been borrowed from verse 11. Not unlikely they had originally been jotted down as marginal explanations of the word that is found in the Received Text.

VER. 10. *But in order that ye may know*: Godwin, overlooking or misapprehending the nature of the word translated *ye may know,* renders it *ye may see.* The word, indeed, has obviously enough a primary reference to *seeing,* but it does not mean *I see.* It is in the perfect tense, and thus originally meant *I have seen,* that is, *I know.* We have no alternative between the two translations *that ye may have seen* and *that ye may know.*———*That the Son of man has authority upon the earth to forgive sins*:—Mark the word *authority,* (ἐξουσίαν). The Saviour is not referring to a matter of mere *power.* Mere power might suffice for removing paralysis from a paralytic; but the forgiveness of sins is a moral act, connecting itself with a moral system, and having to do therefore with moral rights and liabilities. Hence the idea of law comes in; and thus the power to forgive sins must be more

sins, (he saith to the sick of the palsy,) 11 I say unto thee, [i] Arise, and take up thy bed, and go thy way into thine house. 12 And [j] immediately he arose, took up the bed, and went forth before them all; insomuch that they were all amazed, and glorified God, saying, [k] We never saw it on this fashion.

[i] Lu. 7. 22. John 5. 8.
[j] Psa. 33. 9. Acts 9. 34.
[k] John 7. 31. John 9. 32.

---

than mere power or omnipotence. It must be power *that is lawful*, (ἔξεστι). Such power is *right*, and hence it is in the highest sense of the phrase, *a right*. It may, however, be either an original or a derived right. In the Saviour's case it was both. Viewed as divine, he had the right in himself. Viewed as Messiah, he had authority from the Father,—his authority being *authorization*. The Father was the *author* of the *authority*. (Matt. xxviii, 18; John xvii, 2: compare Matt. viii, 9; Luke vii, 8.) No doubt the Saviour refers here to his mediatorial authorization, although, in the substrate of things, this authorization reposed on his own intrinsic right.———*He saith to the paralytic*:–This is a parenthetic note of the evangelist, turning our attention to the sublime transition in the Saviour's address.

VER. 11. *I say unto thee, Arise, take up thy bed, and go thy way to thy house*:–Or, as Tyndale picturesquely has it (1526), *Aryse and take up thy bed, and get the hens in to thyne awne housse*. How thoroughly conscious the Saviour must have been of his divine authority and power! His whole influence in the country and the world at large, in the age and for all ages, lay trembling as it were in the balance, and perilled so to speak on the result of his fiat. If failure had been the result, his humiliation would have been overwhelming and final. The supposed blasphemy of his assumption in reference to the forgiveness of sins would have been demonstrated. The triumph of his censors would have been complete and legitimate. This being obviously the case, he must have known, ere he spoke, that there was really no peril; otherwise, his fiat would have faltered on his tongue, and would indeed have been utterly irreconcilable with the lowest degree of prudence, not to speak of the highest degrees of good sense and sincerity.

VER. 12. *And immediately he arose, and took up the bed, and went out before all*:–"Stoutly making his way," says Lightfoot, "with his bed upon his shoulders." There is some difference of opinion regarding the proper place for the adverb *immediately*. Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Alford insert it in the second clause, *and he arose, and immediately took up the bed*. They have the high authorization of the manuscripts ℵ B C* L, 33. But in a case like the present, more evidence would be needed to warrant an alteration of the *Textus Receptus*. It is not, moreover, a matter of any exegetical moment.———*So that all were amazed, and glorify God, saying, The like of this we never saw!*–The Geneva version is, *We never saw such a thing!* The Rheims, *We never saw the like!* When it is said that they *glorify God*, the reference is to the exclamations, which sprang up to their lips, and flew out from their mouths, the moment they witnessed the marvellous transformation of the man's person. *God be praised! Glory be to God!* At such moments, as on all occasions of very great intensity of feeling, the spirit of man instinctively opens into the presence of the Infinite Spirit. Even in the profane oaths of

13 [l]And he went forth again by the sea side; and all the multitude resorted unto him, and he taught them.

[l] Mat. 9. 9.

14 [m]And as he passed by, he saw Levi the *son*

[m] Lu. 5. 27.

---

the wicked and the atheistic, when such persons are roused into intensity of passion, there is a strange, though strangely distorted, recognition of the presence of Divinity. In some wonderful way spirit touches Spirit, and in moments of intensity the touching thrills into consciousness.

VER. 13. For the paragraph that extends from this verse to the 17th, compare Matt. ix, 9—13, and Luke v, 27—32.———*And he went forth again*:-Namely, from the city of Capernaum. Compare verse 1. The *again* has reference to the previous exit that is mentioned in chapter i, 35. Michelsen admits that the entire verse is one of the true connecting links of the Proto-Markus, (*een van die tusschenvoegsels van Markus*, p. 148). Doubtless, and of the Mono-Markus too.———*By the sea side*:-Tischendorf, on the single authority of the Sinaitic manuscript, reads *to the sea*. But that, surely, is tilting the pyramid of textual criticism on to its apex; more especially as the reading of the *Received Text*, and of all the other important manuscripts, is the more difficult. The evangelist's expression is condensed, but its meaning is evident,-*Jesus went again out of the city, and walked by the sea side.* Jesus was a lover of nature, at once in its open reaches and its elevated peaks. No wonder. It was his own workmanship.———*And all the multitude kept coming to him, and he kept teaching them*:-The multitude of people, whose curiosity and wonder had been excited by the words which they had already heard from his lips, and the works which they had witnessed from his hands, kept crowding after him and gathering around him. *And he kept teaching them*: Now talking to those of them that had pressed nearest him, as he walked along, and now perhaps seating himself on some simple "coigne of vantage," or some boat drawn up upon the shore, and discoursing to the whole company. Our Lord, as Richard Baxter says, "taught the people and "preached the Gospel in field-meetings, house-meetings, mountain-meetings, "ship-meetings, synagogue-meetings, and temple-meetings."

VER. 14. *And passing by*:-The evangelist, after narrating in epitome the Lord's journey to the lake, and his walk by its shore, steps back to take up a certain thread of incident, which happened on the way.———*He saw Levi*:-The same individual, apparently, who was afterwards known by the name of Matthew. Compare Matt. ix, 9. It was quite customary among the Jews for persons, who were entering upon an entirely new career, to assume, or to get imposed upon them, a new name, or a surname that had hitherto been lying in comparative abeyance. Hence the names Paul and Peter. Hence too apparently the name Matthew. Some, however, have supposed that Levi and Matthew were different individuals. This opinion was entertained by Heracleon (*Clem. Al. Strom.* iv, 9) and Origen (*Cont. Cels.* i, §. 376) in ancient times; and by Grotius, Michaelis, and Ewald in modern times. Grotius conjectures that Levi might be a supervisor (ἀρχιτελώνης), like Zaccheus (Luke xix, 2), and that Matthew might be his subordinate officer. Unlikely.———*The son of Alphæus*:-As Alphæus was a common Hebrew name, there is no

of Alphæus sitting [1]at the receipt of custom, and said unto him, [n]Follow me. And he arose and followed him.

[1] Or, *at the place where the custom was received.*

[n] Mar. 1. 17.

---

good reason for assuming with Ewald that the father of Levi was the father of James "the little," the apostle (Matt. x, 3). Levi is tantamount in import to our name *Constant*. But the original meaning of Alphæus is uncertain. (Walton in his *Interpret. Nom.* gives a choice of the three following explanations, "*millesimus*, vel *doctus*, aut *dux*." But not unlikely all three are wrong.)———*Sitting at the receipt of custom*:-The word which is here, and in the other synoptic Gospels, rendered *receipt of custom* means *customs' office*, or *custom-house* as it were. Principal Campbell renders it *toll-office*. Wycliffe, *tolbothe*. Levi is said to have been *sitting 'at'* it, or, more literally, *sitting 'on'* or *'over'* it, (ἐπὶ τὸ τελώνιον). The preposition radically denotes "superposition," and when governing the accusative, as here, it subsumes motion in order to superposition. The phrase, hence, as we actually have it, is somewhat peculiar. It may be interpreted, on the principle of conventional condensation, as meaning *sitting and presiding over the tax-office*. Compare Heb. x, 21, where Jesus is said to be "an high priest *over the house of God*," (ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ). See also Heb. iii, 6; and Luke i, 33. Or, the idea of motion may be merged, (compare Rev. iv, 4), leaving the phrase simply to mean that Levi was *sitting 'on' the elevated table, counter, or 'bank,' which constituted the central and essential part of the tax-office*. The common shops and banks in the eastern bazaars are somewhat like *box-beds*, 'in' and 'on' which, as we have ourselves often witnessed, the shopman or banker sits cross-legged, while either waiting for, or actually transacting, business. No doubt Levi's tax-office would be something of the same kind; and the elevated platform or floor, 'on' which he would be sitting, being also the counter or bench or 'bank,' on which the business was done, would be the real *tax-place*, or, as it is in the margin, *the place where the custom was received*, (the τελώνιον). The rest of the "box-bed" would be the mere surroundings and incidental conveniences of the "office."———*And he saith to him, Follow me*:-Or, as Wycliffe has it, *Sue me*. Our Lord would wish Levi to follow him literally, that is, to take his place behind in the company of his personal disciples or constant attendants. Compare chapter i, 17. There is no reason, however, for supposing that our Lord and Levi had never met before. The abruptness of the call, and the analogy of the case of Peter and Andrew, would rather lead us to the conclusion that there had been some previous intimacy. (See John i, 35—42, and Mark i, 16–18.)———*And he arose and followed him*:-*He suede hym*, says Wycliffe. There was authority in the Lord's "call." Levi felt that it must be obeyed. Honour moreover was conferred by it, as well as duty imposed; and hence it was gladly obeyed. Levi, however, we may be sure, would not leave the duties of the tax-office neglected. If he was a subaltern, his place would be easily supplied. If, as is more probable (see next verse), he was a superior officer, some one or other of his subordinates would be ready to step into his place, until final arrangements should be made. (See Lightfoot's *Works*, vol. xii, p. 182.)

15 [c]And it came to pass, that, as Jesus sat at [c] Mat. 9. 10.

---

VER. 15. *And it came to pass*:—Or, according to the more probable reading of the manuscripts ℵ B L, 33, *it comes to pass*, (γίνεται). The evangelist takes us back with him in imagination, and makes us spectators of the scene, just as it occurs. This present-tense reading is accepted by Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford.——*That as Jesus sat at meat in his house*:—On this one little clause a variety of remarks are needed. (1.) The phrase rendered *as* (ἐν τῷ) is wanting in the same manuscripts which give the present-tense reading in the preceding clause. It is wanting in some other authorities besides, and should be omitted. (2.) The word *Jesus* is in none of the manuscripts at all. There is simply the pronoun *he*. It was Tyndale who substituted the noun for the pronoun, for perspicuity's sake. The Geneva version followed: and hence our Authorized Version. There is no doubt, however, that Tyndale was right in assuming that it is Jesus, and not Levi, who is referred to. (3.) The expression *sat at meat* may be regarded as being either in the present or in the imperfect tense. "The *essential time* of the Present and Imperfect being the same, their two "respective forms in the Indicative merge in one in the other moods, where "*actual time* does not enter, and where they accordingly lose the distinguish-"ing feature which they possess in the Indicative." (Green's *N. T. Grammar*, p. 10). We may translate the expression either thus, *is reclining*, or thus, *was reclining* (*viz. at table*). The word which we translate *reclining* (κατάκειμαι) is the same term which occurs in chapter i, 30, "Simon's wife's mother *lay* sick of a fever." See also chapter ii, 4. The Greek and Roman custom of taking a recumbent posture at table, at least on occasions of formal entertainments, seems to have been common in Palestine in our Lord's time. See John xiii, 23. (4.) The reference of the pronoun *his*, in the expression *in his house*, has been of late much disputed. Meyer maintains that it refers to Jesus. So do Holtzmann (*Die synoptischen Ev.* p. 218), Schenkel (*Charakterbild*, §. 7, 1), Scholten (*Het oudste Evang.* p. 95), and Volkmar (*Die Evangelien*, p. 150, 151). These critics, indeed, are perfectly aware that Luke says explicitly that the entertainment was *in the house of Levi*, (v. 29); but they think that Luke "misunderstood" the Proto-Mark. "Luke first of all," says Volkmar, "misunderstood the expression, and then all succeeding interpreters." Fritzsche, again, is certain that Luke and Mark entirely coincide in their representation. But, says he, Matthew (ix, 10) on the other hand represents the entertainment as being in Christ's own house. What a charm there seems to be in the idea that the evangelists are at war with one another! And yet these very critics, under the spell of this charm, are already at war with one another, and will soon be in deadlier conflict, as to the points on which the evangelists are at war! To one, however, that does not eagerly wish to find war, there is not a shadow of evidence that there is the least conflict in the case before us. Fritzsche is obviously right when he asserts that Mark and Luke are at one, and Matthew is as obviously at one with them both. The house was evidently Levi's. It is perfectly absurd to suppose that Jesus made, or would ever think of making, an entertainment in his own house for "many publicans and sinners." (See next clause of the verse.) True, the pronouns of the narrative are not wielded by the evangelist

meat [p] in his house, [q] many publicans and sinners sat also together with Jesus and his disciples: for there

[p] Lu. 5. 29.
[q] Lu. 15. 1, 2.

---

with the highest classical skill. The "wisdom of words" is absent. That must be admitted. So far as the mere terminology of the first clause of the verse is concerned, there is scope for a fight over the reference of the pronouns, if there be eagerness for the fray. But though there had not been the explicit representation of Luke, there would nevertheless be nothing whatever of the nature or similitude of a reason, for doubting the intentional reference of Mark, in the second at least of his pronouns. If it be the case that Luke borrowed from Mark, or the "Proto-Mark," or, as Michelsen will have it, the Deutero-Mark, then what Holtzmann, Scholten, and Volkmar call his *mistake* was simply his *correct interpretation.*———*And many tax-collectors and sinners were reclining (at table) along with Jesus and his disciples*:—It was just such a company as might be expected in the house of Levi. *Tax-collectors* in particular, and *sinners* in general;—all of them persons who made little or no pretension to religiousness. They were simply, as the saying is, "men of the world." The word translated *publicans* in the Vulgate Version, and hence in our English Version, means simply *tax-collectors*, or *officers of revenue*. It occurs only, so far as the New Testament is concerned, in the three synoptic Gospels. And in all the passages in which it occurs, it is rendered *publicans*, though not quite happily or correctly. The word *publicans* was a Latin term *(publicani)*, denoting the great officers, chiefly belonging to the Equestrian order, who farmed the Roman revenue *(publicum habebant)*, and paid into the public treasury *(in publicum)* a certain definite sum agreed upon by contract with the government. These *publicani*, who were all wealthy individuals, sublet the tax-gathering to agents *(magistri)*, who also became bound by contract to return a given amount of money. These agents, again, engaged local officers, or *portitores*, to collect the dues. It was these local officers, or *portitores*, who are referred to in our New Testaments under the name of *publicans*. They required to belong to the native population, that they might know the ways of the people, and run little risk of being circumvented. And indeed they almost invariably succeeded in circumventing, oppressing, and fleecing, the tax-paying population. They had a definite sum to return to their superiors, and it was needful of course to have a surplusage for their own remuneration. All over the Roman Empire they were hated. They were looked upon as the "bears and wolves" of society. (See Suiceri *Thesaurus*, and Smith's *Bible Dict.*, in voc.) But a double and concentrated portion of hate attached to them in Palestine, for many of the people, more especially of the professedly religious sort, maintained that it was an indignity to God, for the favourites of heaven to have to pay taxes to a foreign and heathen potentate. Hence none but such as were willing to set the popular patriotism and superstition at defiance, could accept the office of tax-gatherers. And all who did accept it, lost religious caste instantly and entirely, and were mercilessly driven into the outskirts of religious society, or farther out still. They were "joined," says Lightfoot, "with cut-throats and robbers." *(Works*, vol. xi, p. 130.) Hence the evangelist associates them with *sinners*, that is with *such as were emphatically sinners*. The term is used in a plane of things

were many, and they followed him. 16 And when the scribes and Pharisees saw him eat with publicans and sinners, they said unto his disciples, How is it that he eateth and drinketh

---

that corresponds to what is related in Luke vii, 37, "Behold a woman in the city, which was *a sinner*." We still use the word in a partially corresponding way when we speak of "saints *and sinners*." It is too, apparently, on this principle of emphasis that we are to understand John, when he says (1 John iii, 9), "whosoever is born of God *cannot sin*."———*For there were many*:–The evangelist justifies his expression "*many* tax-collectors and sinners." It was, he intimates, literally true. There was a large company, and all of the tabooed class.———*And they followed him*:–This clause should have been transferred by Robert Stephens, the originator of the verses of our New Testaments, to the commencement of the next verse, and, connected with the first words thus, *And there followed him also scribes of the Pharisees.*

VER. 16. *And there followed him also scribes of the Pharisees*, or, *the scribes of the Pharisees*:–Such is the connection of the clauses given in the text of Tregelles; and it has been accepted by Tischendorf in his 8th edition. It is supported by the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts (ℵ B), and L Δ, and 33–– "the queen of the cursives," and the Coptic version (cod.). It is, we feel persuaded, the original reading; that of the Received Text being modified after Luke's phraseology. Meyer approves of it. In ℵ L, 33, there is no article before the word *scribes*. It is the most likely reading. The expression *scribes of the Pharisees* means *scribes belonging to the sect of the Pharisees*, as distinguished from other scribes, such as those belonging to the Sadducees. (On the word *scribes*, see on verse 6.) These bigots and formalists had now got fairly on the inquisitorial scent. They followed our Lord to pry into his private ways. And on the present occasion they seem to have entered, with oriental freedom, into the hall, or guest-chamber, where the company were seated at table. It was the apartment corresponding to the *k'hāwah* of modern Arabian houses, such, we mean, as belong to the higher and middle or monied class of society.———*And when they saw him eating with the publicans and sinners*:–Or, according to the reading of Tregelles, and Tischendorf in his 8th edition, *And when they saw 'that he was eating' with the publicans and sinners*, (καὶ ἰδόντες ὅτι ἤσθιεν μετὰ τῶν κ. τ. λ.) In the Vatican manuscript, and "the queen of the cursives," the indicative of the present tense is employed, '*that he is eating*,' (ἐσθίει). All of these variations are quite unimportant, though they none the less claim the critic's deliberative consideration in the adjustment of the text. ———*They said to his disciples*, '*He eats with the tax-collectors and the sinners!*'–Such is probably the Evangelist's original text. It is preserved in the Vatican manuscript, (ἔλεγον τοῖς μ. α. ὅτι μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίει). There is, however, in the best of the other manuscripts, and in ancient versions, an extraordinary and almost bewildering variety of small and practically unimportant modifications and amplifications. Many of the manuscripts, for instance, add *and drinks* to the expression *he eats*. So A C E F H K L M S U, &c. The Vulgate version agrees with these manuscripts; and so do the Peshito Syriac and the Philoxenian Syriac, and the Coptic and Gothic versions. Augustin also notes that the words *and drinks* are found in

with publicans and sinners? 17 When Jesus heard *it*, he saith unto them, [r]They that are whole have no [r] Mat. 9. 12. Lu. 5. 31.

---

Mark, though not in Matthew. (*Consensus Evv.* ii, 27.) They were, evidently, in his day fixed in such copies of the Italic text, as were in his hands. We hesitate considerably whether to regard them as genuine, or as a marginal amplification. On the whole we incline to the conclusion that they were added out of Luke. They are wanting not only in the Vatican Manuscript, but also in the Sinaitic and the Cambridge (ℵ and D). They are omitted too in those manuscripts of the Old Latin version, which are noted *a b e ff*$^2$. It is more likely that they would be deliberately added, than either intentionally abstracted, or accidentally omitted. Again, some of the best old manuscripts, (ℵ C L Δ, 69), as well as the Coptic, Æthiopic, Arabic, and Persic versions read '*Your master eats (and drinks).*' It is an obvious addition from Matthew. Some again, instead of the simple exclamation, *He eats with the publicans and (the) sinners!* have, in one form or another, the interrogation, *Why does he eat (and drink) with the publicans and (the) sinners?* (ℵ D read ἐπὶ τί,—Matthew's and Luke's expression: A C Γ Δ Π, &c., read τί ὅτι,—the equivalent in import of the phrase of Matthew and Luke. But B L, 33, have simply ὅτι, which is justly accepted by Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, as Matthew's autographic phrase. The reading of A C Γ Δ Π, &c., and the Received Text, seems to be an elucidatory *capping* of the original phrase, to assimilate it to the corresponding phrase of Matthew and Luke. Tischendorf understands the ὅτι as having an interrogative import. But with Michelsen we regard it as simply "recitative," and therefore, in English, untranslatable.)—*He eats with the publicans and the sinners!* As if that were one of the greatest and most unpardonable of misdemeanours! As for themselves they had no scruple, indeed, in taking advantage of the customary oriental freedom that permitted the neighbours to enter the tax-gatherer's comfortable *K'hāwah*, or Reception-room. And when once inside the chamber, they had no scruple in seating themselves on the comfortable matting that would be garnishing the sides of the walls all round. They could freely speak too with the tax-gatherer and his company. There was no sin in such things! But *to eat* with them! (See Gal. ii, 11—14.) That was altogether a different affair! It would indeed be one of the pinnacles of profanity,—almost as wicked as to commit adultery or to worship idols! So artificial and angular, and angularly arbitrary, had the notions of the Pharisees become in reference to moral demeanour.

Ver. 17. *And Jesus heard*: We need not say that he *overheard*, for doubtless the censorious scribes, though awed to such a degree by the moral majesty of his bearing that they did not dare to address himself directly, yet intended for his ear what they said to his disciples.———*And saith to them, They who are strong have no need of a physician, but they who are unwell*:—A truism on the physical side of things; but, for that very reason, of the greatest possible significance in its application to the moral side of things. It was the complete explanation, and the unanswerable vindication, of our Saviour's conduct in going into the society of the moral waifs of the population. The validity of

need of the physician, but they that are sick: I came not to call the righteous, but [s] sinners to repentance. [s] Mat. 18. 11. Lu. 19. 10. 1 Tim. 1. 15.

---

the idea, which the truism embodies, is the foundation of all those philanthropic movements which enlist the upper classes of society in the blessed work of bending down to meet in love the lower classes, so that the snapped circle of humanity may be restored. It is the philosophy, in a nutshell, of all home and foreign missionary operations. Christ went among the moral waifs, be it observed, not as a boon companion, but as a physician. The word rendered *a physician* is peculiarly significant in the original,—*a healer*. To whom should a healer go, as a healer, but to such as are needing to be healed? But granted that the publicans and the sinners were "unwell," were the scribes and Pharisees "well" and "strong"? Were they, as our Authorized Version has it, "whole," or hale? So thought not Jesus. But so thought many of themselves; and hence they were not prepared to accept the attentions of the Physician, and his divine panacea. But Jesus, without waiting to debate that matter with them, left them with the general principle, on which he regulated his intercourse with men.——*I came not to call the righteous, but sinners*:—The superadded words in our Authorized Version and the Received Text, *to repentance*, were not in the evangelist's autograph. They were subsequently added, as Mill correctly judged (*Prolegom.* p. cvi), from Luke v, 32. They are wanting in the manuscripts noted ℵ A B D K L Δ Π, as well as in the Vulgate, Coptic, Peshito Syriac, Philoxenian Syriac, Armenian, Æthiopic, and Gothic versions. Augustin, in his *Consensus* (ii, *c.* 27), notes that they were found only in Luke. They are omitted by Griesbach and Scholz, as well as by Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford. They were suspected by Erasmus. The supplement brings out, however, into full development, the Saviour's idea. It was his aim, in his manward mission, *to speak to men in an inviting way*, that is, *to call them*, in order to prevail with them *to stop in the career which they were pursuing, and to turn toward God and goodness*. When he here says that he "came not to call the *righteous*," the term *righteous* is not used, as Grotius supposed, in its comparative, but in its absolute, import. They who are only comparatively righteous are also unrighteous. They are sinners;—and therefore Jesus came to *call them to repentance*. In the absolutely righteous, indeed, wherever they are to be found, the heart of God and of Jesus must have inexpressible interest and delight. But Jesus did not come to the earth to *call* such. They are not to be found on the earth. The Messianic aim of his Father, and of Himself, was to meet the wants of a different class of beings altogether,—of *sinners*. The Saviour leaves his censors to consider with themselves whether they were *sinners* or *righteous*. Petter's notion of the word *righteous* is farther aside from the correct idea, than that of Grotius. He supposes that it means "such as think themselves righteous." Theophylact gives the same interpretation. But it inverts the Saviour's idea. None had greater need than such self-deceivers, to be called, and called to repentance.—There is no article in the original before the word *righteous*, but we must either supply it in our English idiom, or use some other supplementary expression, such as *righteous persons*.

18 [t] And the disciples of John and of the Pharisees used to [u] fast: and they come and say unto him, Why do the disciples of John and of the Pharisees

[t] Mat. 9. 14. Lu. 5. 33.
[u] Mat. 6. 16. Lu. 18. 12.

VERS. 18—22. A new paragraph, corresponding to Matthew ix, 14—17, and Luke v, 33—39. It has relation to *fasting,*—an important exercise of self-denial, when wisely regulated as to time and other circumstances, but an odious bit of self-righteousness, when simply regarded as a feat of religious superiority or meritoriousness.

VER. 18. *And John's disciples and the Pharisees were fasting*:–Such is the proper translation of the correct text, (καὶ ἦσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου καὶ οἱ φαρισαῖοι νηστεύοντες). The evangelist connects the Saviour's teaching regarding fasting with an actual fact that had occurred. The disciples of John on the one hand, and the Pharisees on the other, were coincidently fasting. Instead of *were fasting,* our Authorized Translators have *used to fast.* They followed in the wake of the Rheims Version. Luther unhappily took the same view of the expression; and Grotius too, and Fritzsche; and Michelsen also, who hence regards the whole first clause of the verse as "an archæological elucidation" interpolated into the Proto-Marcus's text by the Deutero-Marcus, *(vers 18a is een archeologische opheldering van II-Markus).* Hammond's paraphrase brings out the right idea, *John's disciples and the Pharisees, 'according to their custom of frequent fasting, were now on a day of fast.'* Instead of *John's disciples and the Pharisees,* our Authorized Version has *the disciples of John and 'of' the Pharisees.* They were reproducing the phraseology of the Received Text, which has *the disciples of John and 'those' of the Pharisees,*—borrowing no doubt from the latter part of the verse. The correct reading—the reading of ℵ A B C D K M Π—is simply *the Pharisees.* (See Griesbach's *Comment. Criticus* in loc.)———*And they come and say unto him*:–Some representatives, namely, of the two parties come,—the Pharisees cunningly playing, no doubt, upon the simplicity of John's disciples.———*Why do the disciples of John and those of the Pharisees fast*:–Such we presume to be the correct reading. It is not only that of the Received Text, but of Lachmann too. Instead, however, of *those of the Pharisees,* Tischendorf and Tregelles read *the disciples of the Pharisees.* The variation is of no exegetical significance. But it is more likely that the word *disciples* would be added by transcribers, than that it would be abstracted. It will be noted that the question proper, which was proposed to our Lord, comes after this two-fold clause, which is but the stepping-stone by which it is to be reached. It will also be noted that the evangelist, so far as this stepping-stone-clause is concerned, gives his report not in the *ipsissima verba* of the questioners, but freely. If the *ipsissima verba* had been given, the report would no doubt have been somewhat as follows,—*Why is it that while 'we,' the disciples of John, are fasting, and also the disciples of the Pharisees, thy disciples fast not?*–Compare Matt. ix, 14. The expression *the disciples of the Pharisees* is noteworthy. For the time being the individuals of the Pharisaic community are regarded as the disciples of the body. As a matter of fact, all the individuals composing the community, would one by one occupy, in relation to the whole, the position of pupils or disciples.———*But thy disciples*

fast, but thy disciples fast not? 19 And Jesus said unto them, Can the children of the bridechamber fast, while the [r] bridegroom is with them? As long as they have

[r] Mat. 25. 1.

---

*fast not?*–This was the real question. *Surely you will not allege that 'we' and the Pharisees are too self-denied. But if not, why is it that thy disciples fast not?* (In the expression οἱ δὲ σοὶ μαζηταί the σοί is not the dative of the personal pronoun, as so many critics –inclusive of Rosenmüller, Kuinöl, and Bland– have supposed, but the nominative plural of the possessive pronoun. See chap. v, 19.)

Ver. 19. *And Jesus said to them, Can the sons of the bridechamber fast, while the bridegroom is with them?*–Would not fasting at such a time be most incongruous? The time referred to by our Lord, in his fine parabolic logic, is the period of festivity –often extending to a week, and sometimes even to a fortnight (see Tobit, viii, 19), –which was consequent on a happily consummated marriage. If there be a time at all when fasting would be inappropriate, it is such a time. A well-consorted "wedding" should undoubtedly be a "gala" occasion, though far removed from rioting and revelling and "unhallowed mirth." The expression *the sons of the bridechamber* is a Hebraistic phrase for *the groomsmen*, whose duty it was to convey the bridegroom to the bride's residence, and, when she was "taken," to accompany the couple back to the bridegroom's home, –giving expression all along the way, and during the whole festivity, to their feelings of gaiety, congratulation, and gladness. They had, in accordance with the usage of Hebrew society, various little duties to perform in connection with the bridal chamber. This bridal chamber is, with admirable literality, designated, in our Authorized Version, *the bridechamber*. The most of the older translators were somewhat at sea regarding the precise import of the term. Wycliffe, Tyndale, and Coverdale, rendered it *wedding;* Purvey, *espousals (sposailis);* the Rheims, *marriage*. But the Geneva Version,—though not the preliminary edition of 1557,—made a great stride in the right direction, when it rendered the term *marriage chamber*. The word, however, really means *bridechamber*, (νυμφών from νύμφη, like γυναικών from γυνή, ἀνδρών from ἀνήρ, παρθενών from παρθένος.) *It was the particular chamber which was set apart for the bride.* And as that chamber was the local centre of interest on a wedding occasion, the very groomsmen, who officiated on behalf of the bridegroom, were called its *sons*. They owed their official function, or, so to speak, their existence as groomsmen, to the existence of the chamber.———*Can the sons of the bridechamber fast*:–The word *can* is of course not used absolutely. It does not refer to what metaphysicians call *physical ability*, but to *moral ability*. The sons of the bridechamber *could not fast* consistently or congruously.———*While the bridegroom is with them?*–This is the correct translation of the expression. The phrase rendered *while* is literally *in which;* and Erasmus and Cajetan understood the reference to be to the bridechamber,—*Can the sons of the bridechamber, in which the bridegroom is with them, fast?* But not only is there a parabolic incongruity in representing the groomsmen as being 'in' the bridechamber 'with' the bridegroom, there is a further objection to the interpretation. The word *bridechamber*, though lexically a distinct and self-contained word, is really, in

the bridegroom with them, they cannot fast. 20 But the [w]days will come, when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and [x]then shall they fast in

[w] Mat. 16. 21.

[x] Acts 13. 2.

---

the case before us, but a fractional part of a compound word, *sons-of-the-bride-chamber*, (=παρανύμφιοι), so that the relative *which* could not, without some degree of violence, look back to it as a detached antecedent. No doubt the expression refers, not to *place*, but to *time*,—*in the time in which the bridegroom is with them.*———*The bridegroom*:–The Saviour beautifully subindicates that He is the Bridegroom of the Church. (Compare Ps. xlv; Song of Songs; 2 Cor. xi, 2; Eph. v, 24—32; Rev. xix, 7—9.) He is the Lover of the souls of men, and wooes them. When he wins their hearts, He becomes wedded to them, or most intimately and lovingly connected with them, and endows them, so far as the circumstances of the case will permit, with all the prerogatives and blessings of his own high estate. But there are tides of things in the "times and seasons" of the Saviour's relationship to men which cannot be adequately set forth within the circle of the limitations of marriage. Hence we must not press the parable at all points.———*As long as they have the bridegroom with them they cannot fast*:–We might have expected that the Saviour would have said, *As long as they are with the bridegroom*, viz. at his house. But he was looking through the transparency of his parable to a peculiar and exceptional case,—his own. He had come from afar to the bride's house to be there wedded to his bride; and by and by he must leave, and return for a season to his "Father's House." There is a good and peculiar reason for such leaving, though it could not with propriety be brought into view in connection with a marriage solemnity. No single human relationship can do justice to the unique reality of Christ's relationship to men.——— *They cannot fast*: Viz. unless they should act with the utmost incongruity.

Ver. 20. *But days shall come, when the bridegroom shall have been taken away from them*:–There is a fine mystical meaning imbedded in the word that is translated *shall have been taken away*, (ἀπαρθῇ). The simple verb means *shall have been lifted up*, and the preposition in composition means *away*. The whole word covertly refers to the crucifixion as *the upward way* by which the Bridegroom of the church was *taken away*. He was *lifted up* (John xii. 32, 33), and thence *went away*. It is noteworthy that it is this identical verb which is employed in the corresponding reports of Matthew (ix, 15) and Luke (v, 35), and that it is employed nowhere else in the New Testament. No doubt it would be the very word that our Lord Himself would use; for in the gentilized district of Galilee he would be almost always speaking in Greek. (See Diodati's *Christus Græce loquens*, and Roberts' *Discussions.*)———*And then shall they fast in that day*:–The Received Text reads here *in those days*, but by a manifest tinkering of the transcribers to make the phrase identical with the expression at the beginning of the verse, and also with Luke's expression (v, 35). *In that day* is the reading of the Sinaitic (ℵ), Vatican (B), Alexandrine (A), Ephraemi (C), and Cambridge (D) manuscripts, as also of K L Δ Π', 1, 33, 69, and of the Peshito Syriac, the Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, Æthiopic, and Gothic versions. It was approved of by Mill (p. cxxii); and though Bengel in his 1734 edition decided against

those days. 21 No man also seweth a piece of [2]new cloth on an old garment: else the new piece that filled it up taketh away from the old, and the rent is made

[2] Or *raw*, or *unwrought*.

---

it, yet in his 1753 edition, as also in his *German Version*, and his *Gnomon*, he reversed his decision. It is received into the text by Griesbach, Scholz, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles. Fritzsche indeed could not make up his mind to receive it. He pronounced it "intolerable." Yet there really is not the shadow of a doubt that it stood in Mark's autograph. It is beautifully and touchingly significant,—not so much rolling the days referred to at the commencement of the verse, and resumptively in the word *then*, into the unity of one long dreary day, as leading the mind back through the indefinite number of the days to the first and darkest of them all, *the day of the lifting up and going away*. That day would give colour and character to many succeeding days. (*Dies unus, auferendi Sponsi; dies multi, ejusdem ablati et absentis.*—BENGEL.) During the continuance of these coming days there would be abundance of scope for fasting; but, most emphatically, would there be no capability of feasting *on the crucifixion day*.

VER. 21. *No one seweth a patch of an unfulled piece-of-cloth upon an old cloak*:—Such patching would be most inappropriate and injudicious. The word *patch* is the proper term for the original ἐπίβλημα. It is Wycliffe's word,—*paccke*. The patch supposed is an unfulled piece-of-cloth. (The genitive of *the material*.) The term which we render *piece-of-cloth* means *a torn off strip of cloth*, (ῥάκος = *rag*). *Unfulled* is the exact idea of the word which our translators, following the Geneva version, render *new*. They were aware that they had not hit on the right rendering, and hence they gave two other translations in the margin, *raw* (the Rheims rendering), and *unwrought* (a suggestion, we presume, of one or other of themselves). None of the three versions was good; but in the margin of the Geneva there is an excellent annotation on the term, "The word properly signifies the new cloth which as yet hath not passed the hands of the fuller." It is the business of the *fuller* to make the cloth *full* and compact by precipitating the process of contraction.———*Upon an old cloak*:—The term, which we have rendered *cloak*, was the conventional term for the outer garment worn by the Jews, a loose cloak-like robe. It is rendered *cloke* in Matt. v, 40.———*Else*:—Literally, *but if not*, that is, *but if it be 'not' the case that 'no one' sews a patch of unfulled cloth upon an old cloak*, which way of negativing a negative just amounts to the positive supposition, *but if it be the case that 'some one' sews a patch of unfulled cloth upon an old cloak*.———*The piece-that-fills-up takes from it, the new (from) the old, and a worse rent is made*:—The patch sewed-on is here called, in the original, the *piece-that-fills-up* (viz. the hole). It is the *complement*, (πλήρωμα),—the *insertion* as it were. Whenever it is damped it shrinks, and draws to itself a margin of the old tender garment.———There are several minute variations in the reading of the text, which have been somewhat perplexing to textual critics. In Michelsen's judgement (*Markus*, p. 150), the text is "nearly unintelligible." He can only, it seems, resolve the difficulty by supposing that "two glosses" from the hand of the Deutero-Markus have been bunglingly incorporated! But there is really no difficulty at all of the kind that Michel-

worse. 22 And no man putteth new wine into old bottles: else the new wine doth [y]burst the bottles, and the

[y] Job 32. 19.

---

sen fancies, no difficulty of exegesis or construction, when we bear in mind that Mark makes not the slightest pretension to classical concinnity of phraseology, or "excellency of speech." We approve of the reading given in the texts of Lachmann and Tischendorf, (*αἴρει τὸ πλήρωμα ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὸ καινὸν τοῦ παλαιοῦ*). It is the reading which we have followed in our translation of the clause; and, when assumed, it makes it easy to account for all the little variations. It is approved of by Alford and Klostermann.——— Dr. Abraham Geiger, the Frankfort Rabbi, has a different sort of difficulty with the passage. Or rather, he imagines a difficulty for the Christian, and imagines it to be insuperable, though he himself can easily overvault it, by landing on the other side of Christianity. He thinks that Christ's illustration is entirely erroneous! *(So ist dies, so viel ich davon verstehe, geradezu unrichtig.)* He fancies that Christ is teaching that it is of no use patching up with new notions a religious system that has become, from age, much the worse of the wear, *(Das Judenthum und seine Geschichte,* iAbt. p. 173); and such teaching Geiger conceives to be wrong. He entirely misconceives, however, the mind of Christ, who is simply illustrating, by a striking little parable, the principle of incongruity, as it would have been exemplified had his disciples given themselves to fasting at a time of feasting. The illustration is perfect, and exceedingly graphic.

VER. 22. *And no one putteth new wine into old bottles*:–The word translated *bottles*, (*ἀσκούς*),—like the word *bottles* itself which is connected with *boots*,—originally meant *skins*. Skins, such as of the goat, are still used all over Syria and Egypt for carrying water, and they were much used in former times for holding wine. At present these countries are under Mohammedan rule, and in the Mohammedan Bible or Koran wine is interdicted; but in our Saviour's time it was a universal beverage, and, when not mixed with noxious ingredients, or otherwise adulterated, or internally spoiled, it was a drink at once wholesome and delicious.———*New wine*:–That is, the new season's wine, "young wine," the wine which had just recently been drawn off from the wine-vat, after the gathering and crushing of the grapes of the season. ———*Old bottles*:–That is, old and frail bottles. The reference is not to skins that had simply been already used, say at last year's season, but to skins which had been long in use and thus nearly worn out,—of a relative age and frailty corresponding to the age and frailty of the old cloak referred to in the preceding parable.———*Else*:–Literally *but if not*, as in the preceding verse. ———*The new wine doth rend the bottles*:–Or, according to the reading of Lachmann, Tregelles, and Tischendorf, *the wine will rend the bottles*, (*ῥήξει ὁ οἶνος τοὺς ἀσκούς*). This reading is supported by ℵ B C D L, 33,—very high and weighty authorities. The future tense of the verb is the more difficult reading when we take the succeeding clause into account, in which there is a recurrence to the present tense. It is not so likely therefore that it would owe its place in the text to the modifying touch of a transcriber.——— *And the wine is destroyed, and the bottles*:–Such is the reading of Tischendorf and Tregelles, (*καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἀπόλλυται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοί*). It is preserved in the

wine is spilled, and the bottles will be marred: but new wine must be put into new bottles.

23 [z]And it came to pass, that he went through [z] Mat. 12. 1. Lu. 6. 1.

---

Vatican manuscript, and L, and the Coptic Version, and is most likely the autographic reading of Mark. The variations in the manuscripts and versions are numerous, being traceable chiefly to an uncritical attempt in transcribers to conform the condensed, abrupt, and somewhat rugged phraseology of Mark to the more flowing phraseology of Matthew (ix, 17), and Luke (v, 37). But the reading that underlies them all is that which we have given.———*The new wine must be put into new bottles*:-An import of a clause, dragged in by unskilful harmonists from Luke and Matthew. It is omitted by the Sinaitic manuscript (ℵ *) and the Vatican (B), and by Tischendorf and Alford in their editions of the text. Tregelles encloses it, as doubtful, within brackets.———Geiger, in this verse too, joins issue with our Saviour. He joins issue even in reference to the form of the parable. He doubts (*bezweifle ich*) whether new skins were less liable to burst than old ones, and appeals to Job xxxii, 19, where we read of "new bottles ready to burst." He does not notice that *the great distention* of the "new bottles ready to burst,"—the idea that gets prominence in the poet's representation,—is the consequence of an elasticity that is entirely wanting in old skins. He is sure, besides, that the inner meaning of the parable is far aside from the mark. It is "at variance with every historical development," for "the law of all development is the gradual metamorphosis of the old by the influence of the new"! *(Der Satz, als ein allgemeiner gefasst, bestreitet durchaus eine jede geschichtliche Entwickelung, in welcher gerade die allmälige Umwandelung, das Eindringen des Neuen in das Alte Gesetz ist.)* And then too, he adds, the negation of this relation of the new to the old is at variance with the statement in verse 20 that "days were at hand when our Lord's disciples would fast," that is, as Geiger assumes, when there would be, on the part of our Lord's disciples, a return to the old bottles! (*Judenthum*, i, p. 174.) What paltering! and all so far away from the sphere of our Saviour's ideas! Our Saviour was not thinking of the development, or non-development, of old things into new. He was not making the least reference to "the law of development." Still less was he inculcating or assuming that his disciples should break entirely with the past, and strike out into novelties of religious belief and practice. Does Geiger suppose that old bottles might, by the law of development, be transformed into new? Does he suppose that it would be an advantage to get old wine changed into new? If not, why refer to development, and carp at the Saviour's parable? *Our Saviour simply meant to illustrate the incongruity that would be committed were his disciples to give themselves to fasting at a time of feasting.* They would be committing, in things spiritual, the very mistake that is committed in things natural, when new wine is put into old frail skins. At the least accession of "after-fermentation" the old frail skins will rend, and both wine and skins will be destroyed. It is a mistake of incongruity, which the Saviour exposes. (See Luke v, 39.)

Vers. 23—28. A paragraph that has occasioned, in some of its details, a

the corn fields on the sabbath day; and his disciples began, as

---

very great amount of perplexity to careful and reverent students of the word. Reckless and irreverent critics, on the other hand, have gloried over it, under the conviction that it affords them incontrovertible evidence that there has been blundering on the part of all the three synoptical evangelists. The corresponding paragraphs in the synoptical Gospels are Matthew xii, 1—8, and Luke vi, 1—5.

Ver. 23. *And it came to pass*:—Or, *And it happened*,—at what particular time, or in what particular circumstances we know not; and we need not be anxious to conjecture.———*That on the sabbath he went along through the corn fields*: The expression rendered *on the sabbath* is the same that occurs in chapter i, 21. The word *went along* is graphic, (παραπορεύεσθαι), suggesting to us a picture. We see Jesus *walking along by the margin of extensive stretches of standing grain.* These stretches, spreading far and wide over the plain of Gennesaret, come down, on either side, close to the path on which our Lord and his disciples and a miscellaneous troop of others are leisurely and gravely walking along in the stillness of the Sabbath. It is an unenclosed path, a mere track, such as is common in the same district at the present day. It leads right *through* the standing grain. Several critics, including Köcher, Krebs, Palairet, Ernesti, object to the translation *through*, and laboriously try to prove that the preposition must here mean *along side of*. They think that the Saviour must undoubtedly have kept on the public highway. It would have been wrong to have used the liberty of trampling through the standing corn of the farmers! The desire of these critics to shield the character of the Saviour is admirable; but their knowledge of oriental roads and corn-fields is singularly deficient.—The word translated *corn-fields* means simply *sown places;* but we learn from what follows that the seed sown had sprung up, and eared, and was now nearly ready for the sickle.———*And his disciples began, as they went, to pluck the ears of corn*:—An extremely free translation, and the clause so translated is the great difficulty of the paragraph. But yet such an expositor as Bloomfield quietly passes over the whole verse, without a single "peep or mutter" or hint or remark of any description whatsoever. The expression, as it stands in the original,—(καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἤρξαντο ὁδὸν ποιεῖν τίλλοντες τοὺς στάχυας)—literally means *and his disciples began to make (a) way, plucking the ears.* The word *began* has, in the first place, been perplexing to many;—more especially as it is not connected, in the original, with *plucking the ears.* It perplexed Beza among others. "There seems," said he, "to be a displacement of the verbs." Hence he arbitrarily connected it with *plucking the ears*:—"They began to pluck the ears." It perplexed Hammond too. "The phrase here in the Greek is," says he, "a little unusual." He would regard the word *began* as an "unsignificant expletive,"—a mere pleonasm. So would Elsner and Wolf, who would consequently ignore the word in translation,—*and his disciples walked on and plucked the ears.* Köcher, however, and Raphel, Rosenmüller, Kuinöl, and others, would rather approve of Beza's "hypallage." Erasmus preceded Beza in his expedient, and Luther too. Tyndale used the same liberty, and the authors of the Geneva Version, and hence

they went, to [a] pluck the ears of corn. 24 And [a] Deut. 23. 25.

---

the rendering in our Authorized Translation. It is, however, a licentious liberty. How then should we construe the expression? Coverdale comes nearer to the original than his great forerunner, Luther. He translates it thus,—*and his disciples begane to make a waye thorow, and to plucke the eares of the corne.* Erasmus Schmid's translation is somewhat to the same effect, but very much more clumsy, *and his disciples began (so) to go, that (at the same time) they plucked the ears.* Both translations do justice to the '*began.*' But they differ as to the import of the expression that is directly governed by that verb. Coverdale says *to make a waye thorow;* Erasmus Schmid says *to go.* A rather hot controversy hooks itself on to the phrase thus rendered, (ὁδὸν ποιεῖν, or ὁδοποιεῖν as Theophylact gives it, and Lachmann too under the sanction of the Vatican manuscript). The great majority of expositors, ancient and modern, translate it as E. Schmid does. But contrary, says Dresigius, (*De Verbis Mediis*, §. 29), to the idiom of the Greek language. When the verb is in the middle voice, (ὁδὸν ποιεῖσθαι), the phrase means *to set out, to advance, to make way, (iter facere).* But when the verb is in the active, (ὁδὸν ποιεῖν), the phrase means, as Viger had remarked before Dresigius, not *to make way,* but *to make a way,* or, as Coverdale gives it, *to make a waye thorow, (viam facere).* Fritzsche insists on the distinction being observed. Lange gives into it. So did Bretschneider and Wahl and Winer. Meyer is most determined in adhering to it, and founds on it a theory of irreconcilable discordance between Mark's representation and that of Matthew and Luke. He is sure that as Mark makes no explicit reference to the disciples' rubbing the spikes and eating the disintegrated grains, so he had no implicit reference to such acts. The Pharisees, he holds,—so far as Mark's representation is concerned,—blamed the disciples, not for doing on the Sabbath day what would have been quite lawful on any other day, but for doing on the sacred day that which would have been unlawful on any day, viz. *making a road through other people's standing corn, by plucking the spikes.* Holtzmann takes the same view of the expression, and of the intent of the Pharisees in their censure, (*Synopt. Evang.* p. 73). And so does Michelsen, (*Het Ev. van Markus*, p. 152), and Scholten likewise, (*Het oudste Evan.* p. 96). These three critics insist on it, moreover, that Mark's account is the original story, and that both Matthew and Luke have "misunderstood" it. Grimm, on the other hand, supposes that if we must interpret the expression as Meyer does, then there is no avoiding the conclusion "that Mark did not report the truth, but miserably corrupted (*misere corrupisse*) the report which he had received from others." (*Clavis*, sub voce, ποιέω.) Krebs, again, has no doubt that Mark's expression properly means *to make a road,* but he thinks that, in using it, he was *Latinizing,* or rendering into Greek a common Latin phrase, (*iter facere, proficisci*), and that therefore, as Mark intended it, the meaning is that the disciples *advanced.* (*Observationes*, in loc.) Others, inclusive of Kypke, Lösner, Rosenmüller, Kuinöl, Bisping, Alford, assume or maintain that in the later and provincial Greek the distinction between the active and the middle

the Pharisees said unto him, Behold, why do they on the

---

voices of the verb, in the expression under question, got to be, to a great degree, confused or effaced. Judg. xvii, 8, is appealed to, as an instance in point,—where we read that the young man of Bethlehem-judah "came to Mount Ephraim, to the house of Micah, *as he journeyed,*" or, as it is in the margin, '*in making his way,*' (*τοῦ ποιῆσαι ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ, in order to push his way).* The expression in Judges is rather peculiar, however, and does not simply mean, as we presume, *to journey* or *advance.* But whatever it means, we see no reason for abandoning the simple and natural interpretation of the expression in Mark; more particularly when we bear in mind the word *began.* We must picture to ourselves, as Klostermann remarks, the "scene." No doubt Mark is retailing the abrupt and graphic phrases of Peter, or of some other reporter, who is speaking from a vivid recollection of what he had witnessed with his eyes and heard with his ears. We must picture, then, to ourselves, the Saviour going along through the corn-fields. His disciples are with him, and a group of others, inclusive of a band of disputatious and censorious Pharisees. They are on their way to or from some adjoining synagogue. Conversation and lively disputation go on, all along the way. At a certain point where there is a crossing, or nearer cut, or a smaller diverging footpath, there is a pause on the part of our Saviour, and of some of the Pharisees with whom he was discoursing. Perhaps they paused, merely that they might stand and talk for a little,—the earnestness of their spirits putting an unconscious arrest upon their physical progress. Or perhaps they were about at that point to separate into different routes. While they stand and talk, the Lord's disciples move on. They "began" to advance. Here is the explanation of the "began." Cajetan rightly supposes that they *began to go a-head of our Lord.* But the very narrow path along which they had to advance, being comparatively unused, was overgrown apparently, at that particular spot, with the crop. When the soil had been prepared, and the seed sown, no care was taken to keep off that narrow stripe, along which the people had right of way. The farmer knew that it was easy for the public to renew the path, just by walking upon it. The disciples, then, began to walk in upon this line of transit, '*making a way.*' They were hungry too. They had been long fasting. And hence, instead of simply trampling down the intervening stalks, they stooped, as they "began" to walk in, and plucked some handfuls of the spikes. They plucked them not from the fields by the side, (although that would not have been seriously objected to), but considerately and economizingly from the stalks that were obstructing the road, and thus *they began to make a way, plucking the spikes,* or *by plucking the spikes.* There is thus not the slightest necessity for having recourse to any rack or strain or out-of-the-way peculiarity, to get the evangelist's expressions bent from their natural import.

VER. 24. *And the Pharisees said to him, Behold*:—Or, *See!* The word was used as an exclamation, *Lo!* But in such a case as the one before us, its primary meaning is not to be lost sight of. The Pharisees turned their attention to what the disciples were engaged in doing, the moment that they "began" to press in among the standing corn. *What are they about? They*

sabbath day that which is [b]not lawful? 25 And he said unto them, Have ye never read what David did, when he had need, and was an hungred, he, and they that were with [c]him? 26 How he

[b] Exod. 20. 10.
[c] 1 Sam. 21. 6.

---

*are actually plucking the spikes as if they were reapers! and they are rubbing them too in the palms of their hands, and eating the threshed-out grains! Who could have thought it? What daring wickedness!* Immediately they turn round, as with surprise, to the Lord, and say, *See!———Why do they on the sabbath what is not lawful?*–It is an inartificial way of saying, *Why do they that which is not lawful on the Sabbath?* Meyer, however, along with Holtzmann, Michelsen, and Scholten, will have it that the meaning is, *Why do they, —and that too on the Sabbath,—a thing that is (at all times and under all circumstances) unlawful?* Scholten is positive that the mere plucking and eating of the spikes "could hardly have afforded an occasion of offence and complaint,"—*(wat kwalijk eene oorzaak van ergernis kon hebben opgeleverd).* He seems to know little of the censorious spirit of ancient Phariseeism, or of its modern oriental analogue—Wahhabeeism. He seems likewise, along with Michelsen, Meyer, and Holtzmann, to be strangely unwilling to look at what is obviously implied in the reply which the Saviour made to the censorious Pharisees. What can be clearer than that it is implied that his disciples were hungry, and that what they did to the standing corn, *they did because they had need?* This was so obvious to the mind of the inartificial narrator, who was bending his thoughts forward toward the words of the Saviour's reply, that he does not make formal mention of the fact. The proprietor of the crop had no right, (Deut. xxiii, 25), and would not be disposed, to find fault with the disciples for assuaging their hunger, as they passed along. But the sanctimonious Pharisees thought it a dreadful desecration of the Sabbath, to do things so like to week-day reaping and threshing, as plucking the ears of the corn and rubbing them in the palm of the hand. (See *Com.* on Matt. xii, 2.)

VER. 25. *And he saith to them, Did ye never read what David did, when he had need and hungered, he and they that were with him?* See 1 Sam. xxi, 1—6. Note the generic *had need* and the specific *hungered*. Note also the inartificial and conversational way in which the expression, *he and they that were with him*, is appended to the affirmation *he had need and hungered*. His followers had need too, and were hungry, but it is on the acting of David, as one of the most eminent of the Jews, that our Lord concentrates attention. Note likewise the archaic expression *an-hungred* in our Authorized Version. It came down from Tyndale, who gives it thus—*anhongred*. The prefixed *an*, like the *a* in *athirst*, is a preposition, equivalent to *on* or *in*, so that the whole expression means *in (the state of being) hungered*. (See *Com.* on Matt. xii, 1.)

VER. 26. *How he entered into the house of God*:–The tabernacle, to wit, while it was located in Nob, an ancient sacerdotal town (1 Sam. xxii, 19) near Jerusalem, (Isai. x, 32). See 1 Sam. xxi, 1—6.———*In the days of Abiathar (the) high priest*:–This is the other expression in the paragraph, which has occasioned difficulty to many, and over which irreverent critics have rejoiced.

went into the house of God in the days of [d]Abia- [d] 1 Sam. 22. 20.

---

under the idea that it furnishes them with evidence that the evangelist has committed a historical blunder. They allege that a blunder there must be, inasmuch as we learn explicitly from 1 Sam. xxi that it was not Abiathar, but his father Ahimelech, who was high-priest, when David entered into the house of God, and ate the shew-bread, giving part of it to them that were with him. How then are we to account for the expression? *That may be somewhat uncertain; but it is absolutely certain that it is absolutely impossible to prove that there is anything of the nature of a blunder.* "There is no need," as Dr. Wall says, "of that supposal." (*Notes*, in loc.) (1.) Some have drawn attention to the fact that it is not said in 1 Sam. xxi, or in any other passage in the Bible, that Ahimelech, the father of Abiathar, was *high-priest*. He is only called *the priest*, and never *the high-priest*. Theophylact threw out the conjecture that this might probably have to do with the solution of the difficulty. Patritius is of opinion that Abiathar was actually high-priest at the time that David came to Ahimelech. (*Com.* in loc. and *De Evangel.* xxviii, n. 38.) Wall and Whiston held the same opinion. *It is probable, however, that Ahimelech was high-priest*, for he "inquired of the Lord," and had "*the* ephod." (See *Whitby.*) Josephus, himself of the priestly order, again and again speaks of him as *high-priest*. (*Ant.* vi, xii, 4, 5, 6.) (2.) Some have supposed that a solution of the difficulty is to be found in 2 Sam. viii, 17, and 1 Chron. xxiv, 6, in which passages there is a transposition of the names *Abiathar* and *Ahimelech*,—the latter being spoken of as the son of the former. Comp. 1 Chron. xviii, 16. It is probable, however, that this transposition is merely transcriptional; and if so, it would be in vain to look to it for an explanation of the expression before us. (3.) Lightfoot imagined that the phrase *Abiathar the high priest* had already in our Saviour's day acquired its curious cabbalistical import of *Urim and Thummim*, so that the whole expression *in the days of Abiathar the high-priest* meant *in the days of the Urim and Thummim*, in the days, that is to say, when the mind of the Lord was ascertainable and ascertained by means of *the Urim and the Thummim*. But this is quite an oddity of interpretation. (4.) Jansen, Petter, a-Lapide, and others, suppose that both Abiathar and his father may have had each other's names for surnames, so that Ahimelech would be surnamed Abiathar, while Abiathar would be surnamed Ahimelech. Beza, in his day, had caught hold of this idea, as an alternative explanation, founding on the passages already referred to, (2 Sam. viii, 17, and 1 Chron. xxiv, 6). It has, however, all the appearance of an exceedingly artificial device. (5.) Beza threw out another conjecture, in the editions of his *Annotations* which succeeded that of 1565. The entire phrase, *in the days of Abiathar the high-priest*, is wanting in the very ancient manuscript (D) which belonged to him, and which he subsequently presented to the University of Cambridge; and hence he wondered whether the phrase might not have crept into the text from an early marginal note. The phrase is wanting not only in D, but also in some important manuscripts of the old Latin version. Archbishop Newcome would have liked to let it go. And, walking in his leading-strings, the authors of the *Improved Version* (Unitarian) actually omit it. Bloomfield too is disposed to part with it. *But without*

thar the [e]high priest, and did eat the [f]shewbread, [e] 2 Sam. 20. 25. 1 Kings 2. 27. [f] Lev. 24. 5.

---

*good reason.* The evidence in support of the clause is overwhelming. And if it should be supposed that the words involve a historical difficulty, it would be unaccountable, on the supposition of their spuriousness, that they should have been almost universally received into the text. But what then? Do they really involve a historical difficulty? (6.) Michaelis thought that the historical difficulty was very great, and, in a kind of despair, suggested that the phrase, instead of being rendered *in the days of Abiathar the high-priest,* might have a topical reference, *in the section* or *paragraph of Abiathar the high-priest.* Comp. Luke xx, 37. Saunier accepts this solution of the imagined difficulty, as the best upon the whole. (*Quellen des Ev. des Marcus,* pp. 57, 58.) But there is really no evidence that the word *Abiathar* was appropriate from its conspicuousness, to give a title to a Scripture-section or paragraph, at least in or about 1 Sam. xxi. And then, besides, the phrase would have required to have stood nearer to the expression *did ye never read?* in the 25th verse. (7.) Le Clerc tries another shift. He supposes that the preposition employed by the evangelist, (ἐπί), instead of being rendered temporally, *in the time of,* should be rendered locally, *in* or *into the presence of, (chez, apud, ad).* Godwin gives the same translation. Middleton and Meyer mistakingly say that it was also given by Wetstein. The passages appealed to in support of it—(1 Tim. vi. 13; Acts xxiv, 19; xxv, 10; 1 Cor. vi, 1; add Matt. xxviii, 14; Mark xiii, 9; Acts xxvi, 2)—are all idiomatic, having a reference to the elevated position of a judge. And no difficulty is escaped,—if difficulty there be,—by means of such a translation. New difficulties, on the contrary, are incurred. (8.) Bishop Hammond saw clearly that the preposition must have a reference to time, but he conjectured that it might mean *a little before the time of.* He says, apologizingly, "The notation of the preposition for the time not then present, but soon after succeeding, is remarkable." He ingeniously appeals, however, to Matt. i, 11, in support of his "remarkable" interpretation. And Richard Baxter, Samuel Clarke, and Owen agree with him. The passage in Matthew, however, has this peculiarity, that it refers to a definite occurrence, and thus to a point of time, whereas this expression in Mark refers either to the period of a lifetime, or to the period of a pontificate. In the case therefore of such an expression as Matthew's, the preposition is naturally employed to denote *close upon the time of:* but in the case of Mark's expression it as naturally means *on* or *in the time of.* (See Raphel's *Annotations,* in loc.) Wells's translation therefore, *about the time of,* is inexact. But what then? (9.) Brameld translates the phrase *during the high-priesthood of Abiathar.* Schleusner gives the same translation. It corresponds with the Syriac Peshito, *when Abiathar was chief of the priests.* But this is certainly a most unnecessary leap into the heart of a historical difficulty. There is assuredly no propriety in giving such a free and *interpretative translation,* when the interpretation of the phrase is the very matter in dispute. Bisping's interpretation coincides with Brameld's, but his translation is correct, *in the time of Abiathar the high-priest.* What is the difference between the two translations? and how does it affect the true interpretation? (10.) Bishop Middleton supposed that the

which is not lawful to eat but for the [g]priests, [g] Lev. 24. 9.

presence of the article before the word *high-priest* is the key that unlocks the whole supposed difficulty. If the article had been wanting, the phrase, he thinks, must have been interpreted as meaning *in the time of the high-priesthood of Abiathar*. Wetstein held the same opinion. But the presence of the article makes that meaning, Bishop Middleton contends, "a sense which the words will not bear." The phrase then means, according to him, *in the time of Abiathar, the (celebrated) high-priest*, it not being implied that he was high-priest at the time referred to. We think that Middleton and Wetstein are both right and wrong. They are right, we conceive, in the meaning which they attached to the evangelist's phrase; and thus the difficulty of the phrase, if difficulty there be, is really solved. Their exegetical instinct led them, as it did Grotius before them, to the true mark. *The phrase refers to the lifetime of the high-priest, not to the time of his pontificate.* But the reason on which Wetstein and Middleton ground their interpretation is as unsound, in its onesidedness, as the interpretation itself is sound. The word '*high-priest*' *without the article* has not necessarily, by any means, the force of a participle, (like Herodotus's ἐπὶ Λέοντος βασιλεύοντος, i, 65). It may simply be added appositively, in order to discriminate, embellish, or characterize the name that is specified,—somewhat like the word *Christ*—put anarthrously after Jesus, (Matt. i, 1, &c.), or the anarthrous word *apostle* after Paul, (Gal. i, 1, &c.), or the anarthrous expression *Doctor of Divinity*, or *Doctor of Laws*, or *Knight*, or *Baronet*, after any proper name in our own times. It is undoubtedly thus added in the case before us. There is a decided preponderance of authorities against the genuineness of the article. It is found indeed in the manuscripts A C Δ Π, 1, 33, 69. But it is wanting in ℵ B L E G H K M S U V Γ. Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Alford, omit it. Bishop Wordsworth both accepts the reading of the text which omits the article, and gives the correct interpretation of the phrase. "The reference is made to Abiathar as one well known to the readers of the Old Testament *as a celebrated high-priest*." When, however, the bishop says that the expression, in itself, "rather suggests that he was *not* the high-priest" at the time referred to by our Lord, he greatly overstrains the case, and overlooks at once the usage and the regulative principles of Greek phraseology. In that he is decidedly wrong. But it is to the point that he adds,—"If our Lord had "mentioned *Ahimelech*, the Pharisees' answer might have been that Ahimelech "was punished by God for this profanation of sacred things; he and his were "soon overtaken by divine vengeance and slain. But by specifying Abiathar, "who was then with his father (1 Sam. xxii, 20), and who (we may reasonably "*infer* from our Lord's words, which are the words of Him who knows all "history) was a party to his father's act, and was afterwards blessed by God "in his escape, and in a long and glorious priesthood, our Lord obviates the "objection of the worldly-minded Pharisees, and strengthens his own argu-"ment, by reminding them that this action took place in the time and under "the sanction of one whom they held in reverence as a venerable ornament "of the pontifical family and dignity." De Lyra brings out a similar idea. —— —*And ate the shewbread*: Or, as Wycliffe, translating from the Vulgate,

and gave also to them which were with him? 27 And he said unto them, The sabbath was made for man,

---

renders the expression, *and eete loonys of proposicioun*, that is, as the Rheims reproduces it somewhat more accurately, *and did eate the loaves of proposition*. The word *proposition* is used in both cases in its primary acceptation, *position before*,—the loaves referred to being *the cakes which were put in position before the Lord*. The reference is to the twelve loaves or cakes, which were regularly kept on the golden table in the Holy Place. (Lev. xxiv, 5—9.) They were *the loaves of the Face*, as the Jews called them, that is, *the loaves of the Divine Presence*,—the loaves which were kept in the Presence-chamber of Jehovah,—one for each of the twelve tribes of Israel. It was a sublime symbolism,—being intended to remind the children of Israel that it was the Lord, their Father, who was their bountiful Provider. It was thus *the Bread of God* (see John vi, 33) which David ate. (See *Com.* on Matt. xii, 4.)——— *Which it is not lawful for any but the priests to eat*:—(The reading of Tischendorf, in his 8th edition, is οὐκ οὐκ ἔξεστιν φαγεῖν εἰ μὴ τοὺς ἱερεῖς. It is the reading of the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts.) It was needful, in the spiritual tuition of the children of Israel, that the whole symbolism of the temple should be treated with the utmost reverence. To *stand in awe before God* is one of the first and most important lessons which men who are but emerging into spiritual culture can learn. It was fit, therefore, that the very Bread, which symbolized the Provision that was divinely made for the whole of the people, should be eaten only by the representative priests. (See Lev. xxiv, 9.)———*And he gave also to them who were with him*:—So that the rule of the sanctuary was relaxed to meet an emergency, not only in the case of David, a man of exceptional eminence, but also, and for his sake, in the case of those who were associated with him. Rules that had to do with the circumstantials of things, as distinguished from the essentials, were stretched for their benefit. All such rules are elastic still, whether they have reference to the sanctuary, or to the Sabbath, or to any other "positive" institution. They are meant to bend to a certain extent, when exposed to stress of weather.

VER. 27. *And he said unto them*:—He added this other weighty observation. ———*The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath*:—One of the simplest and most obvious, but yet one of the deepest and most important, of the apophthegms of our Lord. Thiess is in raptures with it, and exclaims, "What else is intolerance, that most inhuman and unchristian of dispositions, than a perpetual forgetting or reversing of this grand principle of Christ?" *(Intoleranz, diese allermenschenfeindlichste und allerunchristlichste Gesinnung, was ist sie anders, als ein beständiges Vergessen und Misbrauchen des Grundsazzes Christi?)* The verb rendered *was made*, (ἐγένετο), means *was brought into existence*. The Syriac version is, *was created*. The preposition, somewhat barely rendered *for*, (διά with the accusative), means *because of*, or *on account of*. Coverdale's translation of the apophthegm, in all but epigrammatic terseness, is fully better than that of our Authorized Version, *The Sabbath was made for man's sake, and not man for the Sabbathes sake*. The idea is, that the reason, or (occasioning) cause, of the existence of the

and [h] not man for the sabbath: 28 therefore [h] Col. 2. 16.

---

Sabbath is to be found in man, not *vice versa*. Man needs a Sabbath,—man universal. He needs it in order to the highest development of his idiosyncrasy. It would be a total inversion of relationship to suppose that the reason or cause of the existence or idiosyncrasy of man is to be found in the Sabbath. The Sabbath is, therefore, subordinate to man, not man to the Sabbath. The Sabbath is *a means* in order to some *end* or *ends* terminating in man. And thus, as final ends are "first in intention," so that we have to come back through them in order to understand the rationale of the means by which they may be reached, we get to the reason of the Sabbath by going, as it were, '*through*' *man*. (The fundamental idea of the preposition διά is *through*.)

VER. 28. *So that the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath*:—This is an inference, though a-Lapide had difficulty in seeing it, from the incontrovertible axiom enunciated in the preceding verse. Since it is the case that the Sabbath is an institution that finds the reason of its existence in man, the law that enjoins the details of its observance is something altogether different from those eternal and immutable principles which are identical with the moral perfections of the Divine Being. It is elastic in its application to the circumstances of men. It is susceptible of modification by the superinduction of higher laws into the sphere of its operation. And hence He who is emphatically "the Son of man," and who has in charge all the higher interests of man, has full authority to regulate, as he may see cause, the amount and modes of that rest from worldly work which is needful for the highest weal of men. The regulation is safe *in his hands*, though it would not be safe in the hands of every man. Grotius thinks indeed that the phrase *the Son of man* does not refer exclusively or particularly to Christ, but generically to *man*. Fritzsche takes the same view. So does Principal Campbell, who says, "one would conclude that *the Son of man* in this verse must be equivalent to *man* in the preceding; otherwise a term is introduced into the "conclusion which was not in the premises." But nothing is more manifest than that our Saviour was not constructing, in the unity of these two verses, a single formal syllogism. His reasoning is an exemplification of that '*polysyllogism*' *condensed*, which is the characteristic of all untechnical processes of argumentation. Some of the involved syllogisms might be easily disintegrated. *If man was not made for the Sabbath, and if Christ was a man, it follows that he was not made for the Sabbath.* This simple hypothetical syllogism is undoubtedly involved in our Saviour's reasoning. Again, *If he who is emphatically and pre-eminently man and the Son of man be greater than all other men, and if Christ be, as he is, emphatically and pre-eminently man and the Son of man, it follows that he is greater than all other men.* This is another simple hypothetical syllogism involved in our Saviour's reasoning. And no term is introduced into its conclusion which is not in its premisses. Again, *If he who is emphatically and pre-eminently man and the Son of man be also the Son of God and the Lord of glory, and if Christ be, as he is, emphatically and pre-eminently man and the Son of man, it follows that he is also the Son of God and the Lord of glory.* This syllogism too is involved in our Saviour's reasoning.

the Son of man is [i]Lord also of the sabbath. [i] Eph. 1. 22.

## CHAPTER III.

*Jesus heals on the Sabbath a man's withered hand,* 1—5; *and the Pharisees become enraged, and take counsel with the Herodians to get him destroyed,* 6. *Jesus then withdraws to the sea-side; but great crowds continue to flock around him, even from great distances, and he heals many,* 7—12. *He chose twelve apostles to be with him and to take part in preaching,* 13—19. *He returned to town, and was immediately beset by crowds,* 20. *His kinsfolk get alarmed concerning him,* 21. *Scribes from Jerusalem malignantly accuse him of complicity with Beelzebul,* 22. *Jesus refutes this ridiculous and heartless*

---

And again, *If he who is the Lord of glory be the Lord also of the Sabbath, and if Christ be, as he is, the Lord of glory, it follows that he is the Lord also of the Sabbath.* This other hypothetical syllogism is also involved in the Saviour's reasoning; and so good a logician as Principal Campbell might easily have found, if he had looked a little more inquisitively, that there is really no term in the conclusion of the polysyllogism which is not found in its premisses, *when those premisses are explicitly unfolded.* The expression *the Son of man* is, in Christ's own usage, most definitely appropriated to Himself, although the same expression, without the article, is applicable to others as well as to Him. Ezekiel is constantly called, in his Prophecies, *son of man;* and, in Syriac, the corresponding phrase is the common designation of *man,* and is employed, for instance, in the preceding verse, in both the Peshito and Philoxenian versions. When it is said that *the Son of man is Lord 'also' of the Sabbath,* the *also* proceeds on the assumption that the lordship of the Son of man has a wide domain. He is the Lord of heaven, the Lord of earth, the Lord of men, the Lord of the sanctuary, and the Lord "also" of the Sabbath. He hence "doeth with it according to his pleasure," and has a right thus to act. And if so, he had a perfect right, on the part of his disciples, and taking their peculiar circumstances into account, to waive compliance with those rigid and petty prescriptive-usages of the Pharisees, which embodied, not the divine ideas of things, but only their own narrow, and narrowly mis-shapen and superstitious conceptions of the rest of the Sabbath.

## CHAPTER III.

It would have been a happier arrangement of the chapters, if Hugo de Sancto Caro had included within the second chapter the first six verses of this. *(See the Remarks at the commencement of Chapter* ii.)

Corresponding paragraphs to verses 1—6 are found in Matt. xii, 9—14, and Luke vi, 6—11.

*slander, and bids them beware of committing the blasphemy of the Holy Spirit,* 23—30. *His mother and brethren asked him unseasonably and meddlingly to leave his meeting and speak with them, and he seizes the opportunity for asserting a higher kinship than that of the flesh,* 31—35.

[a]AND he entered again into the synagogue; and [a] Mat. 12. 9. Lu. 6. 6.
there was a man there which had a withered hand.
2 And they [b]watched him, whether he would heal [b] Lu. 14. 1.
him on the sabbath day; that they might accuse him. 3 And
he saith unto the man which had the withered hand,
[1]Stand forth. 4 And he saith unto them, Is it lawful to

[1] *Arise,* stand forth *in the midst.*

---

VER. 1. *And he entered again into the synagogue*:—Apparently in Capernaum. Compare chap. ii, 1. *Again*:—He had been there before, though we know not how often. See chap. i, 21. Comp. Luke vi, 6. *Into the synagogue*:—In the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts the expression is anarthrous, *into synagogue*, just as we say *into church*, or *into chapel.*———*And there was there a man having the hand withered*:—It was his right hand, and hence the article, '*the* hand. (Comp. Luke vi, 6.) It had met with some accident, or otherwise suffered some injury, and had in consequence stiffened and shrunk up. The participial expression rendered *withered* indicates, says Bengel, that it was not a congenital defect.

VER. 2. *And they kept watching him*:—*They,* the scribes and Pharisees. See chap. ii, 24, and Luke vi, 7. They *kept watching. Thei aspieden hym,* says Wycliffe, keeping eagerly on the outlook, like watchmen.———*Whether he would heal him on the sabbath day*:—Very literally, *if on the sabbath he 'will' heal him.* The reader is taken back by the evangelist to the time when the spying and watching were going on, and looks forward from that standpoint to the uncertain future. The phrase rendered *the sabbath day* is the same that is incorrectly rendered *the sabbath days* in verse 4, and in Luke iv, 31. See on Mark i, 21. Instead of *if he will heal,* Tischendorf, in his 8th edition, reads *if he heals*—a future precipitated backward into the present. It is the reading of the Sinaitic manuscript, but most likely an accidental variation.———*That they might accuse him*:—Namely, to the ecclesiastical authorities (in Jerusalem). They were eager to get some ground, on which they might denounce him as a person who should not be allowed to go at large. (See verse 6.) The true spirit of ecclesiastical bloodhounds was roused within them, and they were resolved to do their utmost to hunt him to death.

VER. 3. *And he saith to the man who had the withered hand, Stand forth*: *Stand forth* is a free but admirable translation,—a fragment of the Old Geneva rendering,—*Arise, stand forth in the middes.* Wycliffe's version is literal, *Ryse in to the mydil,* that is, *Rise, come into the middle, and stand there.* Our Saviour saw that it was a time of crisis, and so he chose to make the man conspicuous—the "cynosure of eyes."

VER. 4. *And he saith to them, Is it lawful on the sabbath to do good or to do*

do good on the sabbath days, or to do evil? to save life, or to kill? But they held their peace. 5 And when he had looked round about on them with [c]anger, being grieved [c] Rom. 1. 18.
for the [2]hardness of their hearts, he saith unto the [2] Or, *blindness.*

---

*evil?*—He assumes that if a man does not do good when he can, he does evil. To refuse to do good is to choose to do evil. There is *doing* in both cases. There is the outgoing of energy in volition; and thus, radically, it is a question of doing right or wrong, and not merely of doing or not-doing.———*To save life, or to kill?*—Our Lord puts the case strongly, carrying out the alternatives of activity into their most momentous issues. The principle of action, which he wishes to vindicate, is thus seen in its strongest light. All good-doing to men's bodies lies on the line of life; all withholding of good-doing lies on the line of killing or of death. If it would be wrong, in the absence of higher claims, to withhold the good-doing that would save life, it must also be wrong, when the higher claims are still absent, to withhold the good-doing that may be needed to develop life into its fulness of vigour and beauty. What is true of bodies is equally true, on a loftier plane of things, of souls. ———*But they held their peace*:—They *kept silent*, (ἐσιώπων). They did not wish to discuss principles of action. They did not even wish to look into them, that they might understand them. They were simply resolved to hold on by the notions with which they were pre-occupied, and to put down all that might be contrary to these notions.

VER. 5. *And having looked round about on them with anger* (or *indignation*):—Viz. because of the bigotry and tyranny of their spirit. Our Saviour's anger would be no outburst of ill-natured passion. There was no ill-natured passion in him to burst out. And yet in all anger there is intense feeling; only in the Saviour's anger the intense feeling would not be that of chafed and irritated selfishness. There was no selfishness in his heart, to get chafed and irritated. His indignation, like the indignation of God, would be pure and holy, (*ira per zelum*, not *ira per vitium*). It would be the recoil and regurgitation of benevolence. His benevolence was wilfully resisted by the scribes and Pharisees, and thus thrown back into an attitude of antagonism.———*Being grieved*: The expression in the original is significantly full, bringing into view a certain peculiar element of *togetherhood*, (συνλυπούμενος). There is a difference of opinion among critics as to *the precise phase of togetherhood* that is referred to. Some think that it is the union of *the Saviour's grief with (his anger)*. Hence the translation of the word in the Geneva version, *mourning also*. Beza had the same view, (*simul dolens*), and Calvin, (*pareillement marri*). Calvin's translation of the phrase was received into the French Geneva version, supplanting the older translation, (*contristé*). Martin retained the same view of the togetherhood in his French version. Ostervald too. So also Sebastian Schmidt and Erasmus Schmid, in their respective Latin translations; and Elsner likewise, and Petter, and Dr. Robinson. But it is more likely that it is the idea of *sympathy* which is indicated, so that the Saviour's feeling was a kind of *condolence*. Such is the classical import of the word. (See *Herodot.* vi, 39; ix, 94.) Only in the case before us there was a wonderful peculiarity in the *con*dolence. The scribes and Pharisees were not

man, Stretch forth thine hand. And he stretched *it* out: and his hand was restored whole as the other. 6 And the Pharisees went forth, and straightway took counsel with

---

themselves grieved. But the Saviour anticipates, as it were, their inward distress in the future, and is thus *beforehand with his condolence*. So very far was his anger from being malevolent. Malevolence never mourns over the woes of its object. It is utterly destitute of any well-spring of tears. It is only benevolence that weeps.———*For the hardness of their hearts*:–Instead of *hearts* it is *heart* in the original. The expression has something of this force,—*for their hardheartedness*, or rather, *for their heart-hardenedness*. The Saviour was grieved *for* this, or, more literally, *over* this, (ἐπί with the dative). Bending *over* it, he inwardly wept. Instead of *hardness*, it is *blindness* in the margin,—the translation of the Rheims, Tyndale, and the Vulgate. The term is so rendered too in our Authorized Version in the only other two places in which it occurs, Rom. xi, 25; Eph. iv. 18. Compare Rom. xi, 7; 2 Cor. iii, 14. J. D. Michaelis renders it *blindness* in the passage before us. Wrongly however. It means *hardenedness* or *callousness*, or, as Petter explains it, *brawniness*. As here applied to the *heart* or *mind*, it denotes that *moral insensibility* which is the prominent characteristic of religious formalists and bigots. Formalism is like a coating of callosity over the soul. Bigotry is another brawny coat. When it is in its superlative degree, there is an assumption of practical infallibility, which is an exceedingly insensible coat. This assumption is naturally followed by another assumption that all others *should be compelled* to think "as *we* think," and to act "as *we* act,"—the hardest and toughest coat of all. He who is incased in these coatings is proof against almost all appeals that would go to the conscience or the heart.——— *He saith to the man, Stretch forth thy hand*:–Or, as Wycliffe gives it, *Holde forth thin honde*. The Saviour wished the whole assembly to see the hand, and to take note of its shrunk and shrivelled condition.———*And he held (it) out*:–The arm was not impotent.———*And his hand was restored*:–Viz. into its former condition of soundness. It would be a sublime spectacle. When the tide of returning health rushed expandingly through the shrivelled member, the presence and operation of some supernatural power could not be gainsaid. And, so far as history informs us, *there was no attempt to gainsay the intromission of such a power, all through the period of our Saviour's career*. Some said indeed that the power was from beneath, but none denied that a might more than human was in operation.———The appended words *whole as the other* seem, as Tischendorf remarks, to have been imported from Matt. xii, 13. They are wanting in all the most important manuscripts, inclusive of ℵ A B C* D, and 1 and 33. They are wanting too in the most important ancient versions,—the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, Coptic, Armenian, and Æthiopic; the Arabic too, and Persic.

Ver. 6. *And when the Pharisees went out*:–From the synagogue where the miracle had been performed.———*They straightway took counsel with the Herodians against him*: *Straightway*, or *immediately*,—Mark's favourite adverb. All things in connection with Jesus were now moving on in hot haste. The

the Herodians against him, how they might destroy him.
7 But Jesus withdrew himself with his disciples to the

whole district was in a whirl of commotion. Hence the Pharisees, being, with the rest of the population, under the spell of the movement, resolved to lose no time in getting some scheme concocted for laying violent hands on the Disturber. They took the Herodians into their counsels. It is not quite certain who the Herodians were. They were probably a court party among the Jews, who were politically attached to the rule of the Herods, and who either thought, or affected to think, that the glowing predictions of the Old Testament in reference to the Messiah were sufficiently fulfilled in the jurisdiction, military power, and social magnificence of Herod the Great and his family. (See *Com.* on Matt. xxii, 16.) They would not be *a religious party*, or much influenced by religious principles. And hence the Pharisees, in seeking their co-operation to put down the Great Opponent of the irreligiousness of mere religious formality, bewrayed the depth of their own irreligious hate. ——— *Took counsel* :–Such is our English phrase. The Greek expression means *made counsel*, or *made consultation*, (συμβούλιον ἐποίησαν, see Tischendorf, 8th edition). Wycliffe renders it, *maden a counseil*. The Rheims has it, *made a consultation*. ———*How they might destroy him* :–Or simply, *in order that they might destroy him*. See Matt. ii, 8; v, 16. The conjunction (ὅπως) has, in its make, a reference to *mode* or *manner*. But here the reference is not to the mode or manner of the destruction as already contemplated, but to the mode or manner in which they might be able to reach such a desired result as that of destruction. The Vulgate version renders the conjunction *how (quomodo)*, but Beza substituted *that* instead *(ut)*, and Tyndale translates the clause, *that they might destroye him*.—The word *destroy* has reference to a *violent death*. See Matt. ii, 13; xxi, 41; xxvii, 20. Comp. Luke vi, 9, with Mark iii, 4.———De Wette says that Mark's mention of the combination of the Pharisees with the Herodians is an erroneous anticipation of the subsequent coalition which is recorded in Matt. xxii, 16. Ferdinand C. Baur gives expression to the same idea, (*Marcus*, p. 179). But wantonly. Why should it be supposed unlikely that there should be co-operation between groups of the two parties more than once? If the co-operation took place once, why should it be supposed incredible that it took place more than once? And why, again, should it be supposed strange that Mark alone takes notice of this early coalition? Why, when events are in themselves many-sided, should it be deemed improbable or unaccountable that different writers should give different details?

VERS. 7—12. In the brief paragraph extending from verse 7 to verse 12, there is a condensation of many details of our Lord's Galilean ministry. He spoke again and again and again words of grace; he performed again and again and again works of mercy. But the generic sameness of men's wants occasioned a somewhat corresponding sameness in the manifold ministrations of our Saviour's benevolence. Hence one of the reasons that account for the condensation of all the evangelistic narratives.

VER. 7. *And Jesus with his disciples withdrew* :–Such is the collocation of the words in most of the best manuscripts. ———*To the sea* :–Viz. of Galilee. Our

sea: and a great multitude from Galilee followed him, and
from [d]Judæa, 8 and from Jerusalem, and from [d] Mat. 4. 25.
Idumæa, and *from* beyond Jordan; and they about Lu. 6. 17.
Tyre and Sidon, a great multitude, when they had heard

---

Saviour, in retiring thither from Capernaum, would move about from place to place on either side of the lake, seeking opportunities, as they were required, for seclusion with his disciples, (compare Mark vi, 31), and halting for little seasons at the various villages and hamlets, such as Chorazin and Bethsaida. ———*And a great multitude from Galilee followed (him)* :–There is some reason for suspecting the genuineness of the *him*. It is wanting in both the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts, and C L, and the Coptic Version. Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford omit it. It is certainly more likely that it would be intruded than that it would be extruded.—The Saviour could not get seclusion. His fame was ringing all round about in the neighbourhood, and crowds sought to see and hear him.———*And from Judæa* :–A semicolon should precede these words, and thus they should be classed with the clauses of the next verse. It would have been well, indeed, if Robert Stephens had transferred them altogether to verse 8. Not only was our Saviour's fame ringing throughout Galilee, it was sending its peels and echoes far and wide beyond. Many, for instance, in Judæa were stirred.

Ver. 8. *And from Jerusalem* :–Even in the capital city people's wonder and curiosity were excited.———*And from Idumæa* :–Or Edom, the territory that lay across the south of Palestine—stretching toward the south-east. The fame of Jesus had penetrated even thither. Numbers of Jews would be resident in Idumæa,—for, though crushed as a people, they were a prolific race, and were widely distributed over the western parts of Asia, the eastern of Europe, and the northern of Africa. The Herod family came from Idumæa. ——*And beyond-the-Jordan* :—This expression *beyond-the-Jordan* is a kind of indefinite name for the territory that lay east of the Jordan, stretching southward to the Dead Sea, from the Sea of Galilee, or the river Hieromax. The district was called in Greek *Perœa*, which just means *the country on the other side*. It is classed by the evangelist with *Idumæa*, as forming part of one circuit of country, and hence the preposition *from* is not repeated, *and from Idumæa and Perœa*.———After the last clause Beza, Wetstein, Fritzsche, and many others, place a colon, and Principal Campbell and Volkmar a full point, looking upon the clauses *and from Judæa, and from Jerusalem, and from Idumæa and Perœa* as constituting the train of the preceding clause *from Galilee*. It is much better, however, with Heumann, Lachmann, and Meyer, to detach the train,—and to connect it with what comes after. See the last clause of the verse.———*And about Tyre and Sidon* :–That is *And (from) the territory about Tyre and Sidon*. This territory is added to Idumæa and Perœa as completing the circuit of country round the Holy Land, and hence all the three localities are classed together under the one preposition *from,—and from Idumæa, and (the territory) beyond Jordan, and (the territory) about Tyre and Sidon*. In our Authorized Version we read *and 'they' about Tyre and Sidon*. It is the reading of the Erasmian or Received Text, and was in the editions of the original which were lying before our translators. But the

what great things he did, came unto him. 9 And he spake to his disciples, that a small [e] ship should wait on him because of the multitude, lest they should throng him. 10 For he had healed many; insomuch that they [3] pressed

[e] Mar. 4. 1.

[3] Or, *rushed.*

---

*they* had been intruded by transcribers who had missed the thread of the construction. It is wanting in the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts (ℵ and B), as also in C L Δ, and in the Syriac Peshito version, and the Æthiopic, and several of the most important manuscripts of the Old Latin or Italic. It is properly thrown out of the text by Tregelles, and by Tischendorf in his 8th edition. The evangelist's language is to a large extent aggregative, and the jointing of the aggregated parts is left a little loose. But there is really no difficulty in determining where the train begins and ends. See next clause. ———*A great multitude, hearing what things he was doing, came to him*:—This "great multitude" was *from* Judæa, Idumæa, Peræa, and the vicinity of Tyre and Sidon. They "came" to Jesus. Note the verb. It is said of the "great multitude" from Galilee, that they "followed" him,—a word that was appropriate for the inhabitants of the Galilean towns, out from which Jesus "withdrew to the sea," but inappropriate to express the primary movement of the inhabitants of the remote places specified. These, *hearing what (wonderful) things he was doing*, (ἀκούοντες ὅσα ἐποίει), '*came*' *to him* to see and to hear.

VER. 9. *And he spake to his disciples*:—No doubt after he had already been long engaged in ministering to the growing and exacting multitude. ———*That a small boat should wait on him*:—Or, should keep in constant attendance on him, (προσκαρτερῇ). The conjunction translated *that* is literally *in order that*, (ἵνα), so that the clause explains for what purpose it was that the Saviour had turned aside and spoken to his disciples. Hence the excellence of our Authorized Translation, "he *spake* to his disciples." In Tyndale and the Geneva the rendering is not so happy, "he *commanded* his disciples." ———*Because of the crowd, in order that they might not press upon him*:—The Geneva version of 1557 gives a very exaggerated translation to the verb, *lest they should thronge hym to death*. The word, however, does denote *squeezing* or *jamming*, (Felbinger, *drükketen*). ———It is not expressly said, as Meyer remarks, that our Lord taught the people out of the boat. But we like to imagine that he did. (Comp. chap. iv, 1, 2.)

VER. 10. *For he healed many*:—The evangelist thus explains how it came to pass that the people pressed in upon the person of our Lord. Had he merely taught, like a great Rabbi, they would probably have kept at a respectful distance. But he healed as well as taught. Healing "virtue" seemed to stream out from him at all points. ———*So that they were falling on him*:—Such is the literal translation of the expression, (ὥστε ἐπιπίπτειν αὐτῷ). The verb employed almost invariably receives the same translation in the other passages where it occurs. See Luke xv, 20; Acts x, 44; xi, 15; xiii, 11; xix, 17; xx, 10, &c.) In English, however, the phrase, with subject and object such as it has before us, has got stiffened into an idiom that expresses hostile attack, or assault. In the case before us it appropriately represents the eager and im-

upon him for to touch him, as many as had plagues.
11 And ᶠunclean spirits, when they saw him, fell ᶠ Chap. 1. 24.
down before him, and cried, saying, Thou art the Son Lu. 4. 41.
Jas. 2. 19.

---

petuous pressing, and bending forward almost to the angle of falling, that would be characteristic of the crowd of patients who gathered around our Lord and sought to come in contact with his person. Hammond thinks that interpreters have "mistaken" the import of the phrase, and that it means "so that they *fell down before* him." But he has entirely failed to realize to himself the peculiarity of the represented scene.———*In order that they might touch him*:–For it was the Saviour's pleasure that there should in general be some perceptible connection between himself and the objects of his healing ministrations.———*As many as had plagues*:–Or, *scourgings*, as the word literally signifies, and as it is translated in Acts xxii, 24; Heb. xi, 36. The phrase here denotes *diseases*, or *syknessis* as Purvey has it; only it graphically represents, on the one hand, the torture which they frequently inflict, while it suggests, on the other, that they are themselves *inflictions*. There is something '*penal*' in their '*pain*.' (See *pœna*.) The idea is true, though it leads the thought into an exceedingly complicated subject, which, if one's clue be insufficient, would speedily issue in an inextricable tanglement. The word *plague* has now a more restricted signification than it once had. It originally just meant *a stroke*. In its more modern acceptation, it is, says Archbishop Trench, "a title given to great pestilences, because the universal conscience of men, which is never at fault, believed and confessed that there were *strokes* or *blows* inflicted by God on a guilty and rebellious world." (*Study of Words*, p. 40.)

Ver. 11. *And the impure spirits*:–Note the article, pointing to those particular impure spirits who acted their part in the wonderful scene.———*Whenever they saw him*:–The expression is peculiar in the original, (ὅταν αὐτὸν ἐθεώρουν). The force of the imperfect tense and indicative mood might be represented thus, *whenever they saw him (as was repeatedly the case)*.———*Fell down before him*:–Or, as the Rheims renders it, *fell down unto him*. They fell down at his feet, doing homage as it were. *The impure spirits* thus acted in the way of actuating the bodies of the possessed. It was a cunning demonic "dodge." But it differentiated demoniac possession from ordinary maladies. (See on chap. i, 23.) "It is everywhere plain in the New Testament and all antiquity," says William Whiston, "that the symptoms of demoniacal distempers were very different from the symptoms of other diseases." (*Account of the Demoniacks*, p. 55.)———*And exclaimed, saying, Thou art the Son of God*:–That is, *Thou art no mere man! no mere son of man, like other men! Thou art come direct from God, in fulfilment of ancient prophecies, to put an end to our dominion over men!* We need not suppose, with Cajetan, that they uttered this confessional exclamation only tentatively, to find out whether or not our Saviour was the Son of God. It is unwaveringly affirmative; but it would no doubt be wrung from them under the influence of disappointment and hate. (Chap. i, 26.) They felt that they could not retain their hold on their prey, in the presence of the Great Deliverer. The

of God. 12 And he [g]straitly charged them that they should not make him known.

[g] Mat. 9. 30. Mat. 12. 16.

---

"virtue" which went out from him, constrained them to let go. But they hoped, we may imagine, that the audible utterance of their acknowledgement might suggest a suspicion of collusion with themselves. "It is certain," says Petter, "that in making their confession, they aimed at evil and sinister ends."

VER. 12. *And he straitly charged them*:—*Straitly*, literally, *much*, (πολλά). And so the term is rendered in chap. i, 45; v, 10; John xiv, 30; Rom. xvi, 12; Rev. v, 4, &c. Wycliffe renders it *gretely*; the Geneva, *sharply*; the Vulgate, Erasmus, and the Rheims, *vehemently*; Whiston and Bisping, *earnestly*; Mace, Wakefield, Pr. Campbell, Thomson, Young, *strictly*.—*Charged*:—The original term means *rated*, (ἐπετίμα). It is generally translated *rebuked* in our Authorized Version. See Matt. viii, 26; xvi, 22; xix, 13; xx, 31; Mark i, 25; ix, 25, &c. It indicates that our Saviour spoke sharply and peremptorily.—*Them*: It is too generally assumed that the reference of this pronoun is exclusively to *the impure spirits*. The evangelist, however, had already, in the language of the preceding verse, intertwined a double reference to the spirits and their victims. He speaks of *their prostration at the feet of our Lord*. His thoughts thus oscillated for a little from the one party to the other. But as he mentally traced the actual progress of the events to which he refers, he sees the demoniacs delivered; he takes note of their noisy demonstrations of ecstasy and zeal, when once they felt themselves free; he then naturally classes them with the others who had been healed, (see *v.* 10); and then, while thinking of the whole number of the cured, he says, *and he spake very peremptorily to them*. Such was Matthew's understanding of the case; chap. xii, 16—20. And even although we had not Matthew's testimony, a careful and unbiassed effort to disintegrate the elements of Mark's artlessly condensed representation should lead us to the same result. Surely it is a much more natural conclusion than to suppose, with Volkmar, (p. 239), that Matthew, in condensing Mark's narrative, imprudently copied verse 12, while leaving out verse 11! ——*In order that they might not make him known*, or *manifest*, (φανερόν):—These words represent, not exactly what our Lord said to the healed persons, but what was the end he had in view in saying what he said, (ἵνα). He wished to prevent them, as far as possible, from spreading themselves abroad over society, and zealously proclaiming that he was the Great Deliverer. His popularity with the common people was already inconveniently great. There was besides too much tendency to make use of him for merely physical relief. A time too of quiet was needed for the progressive instruction of his disciples in things moral, spiritual, and Messianic. And he shrank, with true delicacy of spirit, from the din and dust and "muscular" rush and roar and rant of those excited mobs of admirers, in the tides of whose applause moral and political mountebanks think themselves glorified.

VERS. 13—19 constitute another snatch of narrative, exceedingly condensed. Compare Matt. x, 1—4, and Luke vi, 12—16. Tregelles, however, adds verse 13 to the preceding paragraph, and commences the new paragraph with verse

13 And he [h]goeth up into a mountain, and [i]calleth *unto him* whom he [j]would: and they came unto him.
14 And he ordained twelve, that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach,

[h] Lu. 6. 12.
[i] Mat. 10. 1. Lu. 6. 13.
[j] John 15. 16.

---

14. Unnaturally. Tyndale, Coverdale, Griesbach, Schöttgen, Bengel (ed. 1753), Tischendorf, begin the new paragraph with verse 13.

VER. 13. *And he ascended into the mountain*:–We know not exactly when; we know not exactly where. Neither the precise chronology, nor the precise topography, of the event, was interesting to the evangelist. He had heard, however, from the lips of his informant, that it was "*the* mountain," into which the Lord ascended, that is, *the particular 'high-land' of the locality that was present to the thoughts of the narrator*. Compare Matt. v, 1. Of course it was some one or other of the numerous upland spots in the vicinity of the Sea of Galilee at its northern extremity. Our Lord "ascended *into* the mountain," –that is, *into* some of the scoops or gorges that intersected the face of the eminence.———*And calleth to him whom he himself pleased*:–We need not fancy anything like vociferation in the call; for we need not suppose, on the one hand, that our Saviour had ascended to any very great height, and we must bear in mind, on the other, that in those still regions of comparatively bare rock, and thus of universal "sounding-board," the voice is easily carried. Our Lord called to him "whom *he himself* pleased," (οὓς ἤθελεν αὐτός). He did not allow any of his general followers to offer themselves, ultroneously, for special work and special privilege.———*And they departed to him*, (ἀπῆλθον πρὸς αὐτόν):–Namely, from the rest of the people who remained below.

VER. 14. *And he ordained twelve*:–Literally, *And he made twelve*, an exceedingly artless expression; and, in conjunction with the following clause, just as artlessly, though not literally, rendered by the Vulgate, *And he made that twelve should be with him*, (Rheims translation). Tyndale and Coverdale, instead of the generic *made*, have the specific *ordained:* the Geneva, Norton, Sharpe, *appointed;* Principal Campbell, *selected*. The term may be freely so rendered; but still it just means *made*. It would appear that our Lord had called up to him a select number of his most attached followers; and then *from these* he selected twelve. See Luke vi, 13. Standing somewhat apart from the company, he would tell Peter to advance nearer to him. That was one. Then he would call perhaps on Andrew, the brother of Peter. That would make two. Then he would call on the other pair of brothers, James and John. That would make four. And thus he would proceed, till *he made twelve*, the full number of the children of Israel. The Lord, it would appear, delighted to realize, in his institution of the apostolate, his relation to the whole of the Israelites, as representative of the whole of mankind.———*In order that they might be with him*:–He had a particular aim in "*making* twelve." It was, first of all, in order that they might be his constant attendants. He wished to have them beside him, that he might pour his spirit into them, and train them, at once by light and by love, to be his fellow-labourers, and his successors, in teaching the people.———*And in order that he might send them forth to preach*:–Namely, by and by, when they were inwardly equipped. *That he might send them forth*, (ἀποστέλλῃ), that is, that he might make *apostles*

15 and to have power to heal sicknesses, and to cast out devils. 16 And Simon he [k]surnamed Peter; 17 and

[k] John 1. 42.

of them. (ἀπόστολοι). This was his ulterior aim. Our Lord could not himself reach very many with his own individual voice; and hence he multiplied it as it were. He knew that it was all-important for the Israelites in particular, and thence for all men, that they should be earnestly *spoken to* in reference to the kingdom of God. Hence "preachers," or *heralds of good news*, were needed.

VER. 15. *And to have authority to cast out the demons*:—"*The* demons," to wit, which were so rampant in human society, annoying, oppressing, defiling, and abusing men. (See chap. i, 23, 32.) Note the expression *to have authority*. We might have expected the evangelist to have said simply, *and to cast out the demons*. But the power of exorcising was so different from the power of preaching, that the evangelist makes special mention of the divine authorization with which they would require to be endued.

VER. 16. *And he made the twelve*: This artless repetitive clause, with the addition of the retrospective article, is inserted by Tischendorf in his 8th edition of the text. Apparently on good authority,—the authority of the Sinaitic, Vatican, Ephræmi, and San Gallensis manuscripts (ℵ B C* Δ), and the Æthiopic manuscript m. The clause had got to be early dropped, as bearing the aspect of a useless repetition.———*And he imposed on Simon the name Peter*:—Another exceedingly artless expression. The evangelist intends to enumerate the Apostles, and begins with Peter. But instead of introducing the surname in a subordinate clause, *Simon, on whom he imposed the name Peter*, he narrates the imposition of the name in a capital clause, and then leaves the narration as sufficing for the enumerative object that he had in view. The word *Simon* or *Simeon* is Hebrew, meaning *hearing*. The word *Peter* is Greek, meaning *stone*. As imposed, however, upon the chief of the Apostles, it is not to be regarded as referring to any little pebble in the brook, or any accidental chip of rock lying on the road or in the field. Galilee and the surrounding lands were remarkable for massive stone structures. The most conspicuous of these were sacred edifices temples; and the foundation-stones of these temples were invariably large and imposing. It would be with a view to these large and conspicuous foundation-stones that our Lord would call Simon a Stone. He was spiritually large and strong, massive and shapely,—fit to constitute an important part of the substructure of the great spiritual temple of God. (See Matt. xvi, 18.) There is no reason for supposing, with Cajetan and Meyer, that the name *Peter* was imposed on Simon just at the particular time referred to. (See John i, 42.) The evangelist simply takes the opportunity, in his own artless way, of recording the new name, and of mentioning that it was given to Simon by our Lord.

VER. 17. Mark does not classify the Apostles in pairs, as Matthew does. (x, 2—4), although it is he who mentions that by and by they were sent out in pairs. (Chap. vi, 7.) He heaps their names together in an artless manner, but is particular, like the other evangelists, about the first and the last. He is also particular, unlike Matthew, and Luke in his Gospel (vi, 14), to introduce James and John between Peter and his brother Andrew, thus recognizing

James the *son* of Zebedee, and John the brother of James;

---

the pre-eminence of the triumvirate, who were admitted by our Lord into his most intimate fellowship. (See Mark ix, 2; xiv, 33.) The same intersection occurs in the *Acts of the Apostles*, i, 13.———*And James the son of Zebedee*: James is thus patronymically marked out to distinguish him from the other apostolical James, the son of Alphæus. See next verse.———*And John the brother of James*: John had no doubt been the younger brother, and hence his position in the list, though he ultimately became much more distinguished than his brother. See chap. i, 19; and compare Luke ix, 28.———*And he surnamed them Boanerges, which is, Sons of thunder*: The expression rendered *surnamed*, means literally *imposed on them 'names.'* Note the plural "names." It seems to justify us in concluding that each of the brothers would bear the "name" *Son-of-thunder* or *Bar-r'ges*. The two names combined make *Sons of thunder*, or *Boanerges*, that is *Boané-r'ges*. The word *Boané*, meaning *Sons of*, must have been a provincial or otherwise peculiar way of pronouncing *Bené* or *Benai*. (*Bené* is Hebrew and Chaldee; *Benai* is Syriac.) Drusius, indeed, was perplexed with the broadness of the pronunciation, and supposed that the word, as found in the evangelist's text, must have been accidentally mis-spelled, and that it should be written *Bané*. (*Præterita*, in loc.) Beza was nearly of the same opinion. "It is obvious," says he, "that the o should be expunged." But this is going much too far in an assumption of purism of pronunciation among the Galileans. There are often the strangest freaks of variation in pronunciation. There would be in Galilee; especially in the "broad" direction. (See Matt. xxvi, 73.) The manuscripts are unanimous in reading *oa;* and Hugh Broughton says, "At this day scheva is sounded by the Jews themselves as *oa*, as for example *Noaby-im*," (for *Neby-im*). (*Works*, p. 706.) The other moiety of the surname, viz. *r'ges* or *r'gesh*, (רְגֶשׁ or רֻגֶשׁ – ), has also occasioned to critics unnecessary difficulty. It is true that in the classic passages in which the term occurs, it means, not *thunder*, but an *assembly* or *crowd*. (See Psa. lv, 14.) In no passage of the Targums, it would appear, or of the Talmud, does it indisputably mean *thunder*. (See *Patritius*, in loc.) Nor is Meyer warranted to say that the word means *thunder* in Syriac. It is, however, very evidently onomatopoetic, having primarily a reference to *noise*. (See Buxtorf's *Lexicon Talmud.* sub voce.) Hence the translation which the cognate verb receives in the Septuagint version of Psalm ii, 1, (ἐφρύαξαν), —a translation to some extent reproduced in our English Version, "why do the heathen *rage?*" In the margin it is, *tumultuously assemble*. Castell conjectured that there was a connection between the word and our Saxon *rush*, which is undoubtedly onomatopoetic. (*Lexicon*, sub voce.) We may be sure, at all events, that in the Galilean dialect the name did mean *thunder*.—The whole compound word was perplexing to Jerome. He looked at it apparently from too classic a standpoint, both as regards the pronunciation of the first part, and as regards the conventional acceptation of the second. He hence proposed to amend it into *Bene-re'em*, (that is, בְּנֵי רֵעֵם). "The name," says he, "is not, as most suppose, *Boanerges*, but is more correctly read *Bene-reem*." (*Comm. on Dan.* i, 7. See also his *Comm. on Isai.* lii, 4, and his *Lexicon of Hebrew Names.*) Luther was so far swayed by Jerome's authority as to

and he surnamed them Boanerges, which is, The sons of thunder: 18 and Andrew, and Philip, and Bartholomew,

---

introduce his word into the text. He gives it thus, *Bnehargem*. Stunica too accepted it, and Maldonat, and le Clerc. Grotius, again, supposed that the second moiety of the word was neither *r'ges* nor *re'em*, but *re'es* or *ra'ash*, (רַעַשׁ), which is sometimes translated *rushing*, sometimes *earthquake*, and in Isai. ix, 5, *confused noise*. Hammond followed Grotius: but, unhappily. For *re'es* or *ra'ash* is expressly distinguished in its meaning from *thunder* in Isai. xxix, 6. There is really no occasion for racking ingenuity to account for the evangelist's term. There is no difficulty in accepting it just as we have it, when we take the power of pronunciation into account, and the obvious onomatopoetic force of the term.—The rationale of its application to James and John has, like everything else about the term, been keenly disputed. *It is unknown*, as Le Clerc observes. It can, therefore, be only conjectured. The Fathers in general conjectured in a spiritual direction. They supposed that the term glances at the general power of the Gospel as preached by the two apostles. (See *Suiceri Thesaurus*, sub voce *βροντή*.) Heumann conjectured in another direction, that the name was intended to be a term of reprimand or reproach, *(ein Schelt-Nahme)*, because James and John had said, in reference to certain Samaritan villagers, "Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven, and consume them, even as Elias did?" (Luke ix, 54.) It is a most unlikely interpretation, though approved of by Whitby. Our Lord would not deal in nicknames; and if he had ever allowed himself in such a licence, he would have called his inconsiderately ardent disciples *Sons of fire* rather than *Sons of thunder*. A-Lapide supposed that the name was imposed, because the Lord designed that the brothers should excel the other apostles in their power of preaching and propagating the Gospel. He thinks in particular that the commencement of John's Gospel evinces all the peculiar majesty of thunder and lightning. Luther took a corresponding view. *(Glos.* in loc.) It is, however, far more likely that there is a simple reference, in the surname, to some deep-toned peculiarity of voice which was characteristic of the brothers, and which would eminently fit them, when engaged in addressing their fellow-men, for rolling in on the mind and heart, with awe-inspiring effect, the solemnities of religion. This view of the import of the surname was taken by Beza, and Pfeiffer *(Ebraic. et Exotic.* xviii, 4). It is not quite the same idea as was suggested by the peculiar style of Pericles's oratory, —the "thunder and lightning" style, *(ut non loqui et orare, sed quod Pericli contigit, fulgurare ac tonare videaris.*—QUINCTILIAN, *Inst.* ii, 16),—but it does lie to a certain extent on the same line of thought. The filial element of the phrase, namely *Sons of*, is an exemplification of a favourite idiom among the Hebrews. (Compare chap. ii, 19.) The entire compound surname was on the whole equivalent to *Thunderers* (*οἱ βροντῶνες*—Euthymius Zigabenus). But it suggested this idea over and above, that the brothers *derived* no little portion of their differentiating peculiarity as preachers from the solemn thunder-tone that was inherent in their voices.

VER. 18. The remaining names are heaped together.———*And Andrew*:—A Greek name, meaning *Manly*. It is an incidental proof of the prevalence of

and Matthew, and Thomas, and James the *son* of Alphæus,

---

the Greek language in Galilee. He was the brother of Peter, (chap. i, 16), and has left behind him in history but few traces of his career. He is reported, says Eusebius, on the authority of Origen, (*Hist.* iii, 1), to have gone to Scythia to preach the Gospel; and he is said to have suffered martyrdom on a decussated cross (or X), which is hence called the *St. Andrew Cross.* ———*And Philip*:–Another Greek name, meaning *Fond of horses.* It was this Philip who said to Nathanael *Come and see.* (John i, 43–51.) Little is known of his career. He is said to have died at Hierapolis. (Eusebius, *Hist.* v, 24.) ———*And Bartholomew*:–A Hebrew patronymical name, signifying *Son of Tholomew* or *Talmai.* It is not unlikely that he was Nathanael, (John i, 43–51); and he might be generally called *Bartholomew*, to distinguish him from some other Nathanael in the same circle. (Compare John xxi, 1, 2.) He is said to have gone to India to preach the Gospel. (See Eusebius, *Hist.* v, 10; and Jerome, *de Viris Illustribus*, xxxvi.)———*And Matthew*:–The "publican" or officer of revenue (Matt. x, 3),—no doubt also the evangelist. (See *Introd. to Com. on Matt.*) His name is Hebrew, and means *Gift-of-God* or *Theodore.* ———*And Thomas*:–Another Hebrew name, meaning *Twin.* Its Greek synonym is *Didymus.* (See John xi, 16; xx, 24; xxi, 2.) There are many traditions regarding his ultimate career. Origen reports that he preached the Gospel in Parthia. (Eusebius, *Hist.* iii, 1.) There is extant a *Gospel according to Thomas* among the New Testament Apocrypha.———*And James the (son) of Alphæus*:–Wycliffe's translation is, *and James Alfey.* Jerome, in his treatise on *the Perpetual Virginity of Mary*, written against Helvidius, maintains that Alphæus was the husband of Mary the sister of the Virgin Mary; and he hence supposes that the James here specified was one of our Lord's "brethren," being elsewhere called "James the little" (Mark xv, 40). By "brethren" he understands *cousins-german.* W. H. Mill maintains the same view. (*The Descent and Parentage of the Saviour*, sect. 3.) There seem, however, to be almost insuperable difficulties in the way of accepting such a genealogical theory. It is not likely that Mary our Lord's mother would have a sister also called Mary. The statement in John xix, 25,—on which the whole theory is based, may be legitimately interpreted on the principle that four women are referred to, not three. It is on this principle that the Peshito translation of the passage is constructed,—"Now there stood by the cross of Jesus his mother, and the sister of his mother, *and* Mary (the wife) of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene." The older theory regarding the "brethren" of our Lord, (that they were the children of Joseph by a previous marriage),—the theory that preceded both that of Helvidius (that they were Mary's children) and that of Jerome (that they were the children of Mary's sister Mary), is the most probable of all. It has the advantage, in addition to other recommendations in its favour, of accounting for the air of superiority and precedence assumed by the "brethren" in relation to our Lord. (John vii, 3—10; Mark iii, 21.) It is certainly not at all probable that any of the apostles would be of the number of the "brethren." (See John vii, 5.)—*Alphæus*:–There is no reason for supposing that this is the same *Alphæus*, who has been already referred to as the father of Levi or Matthew. (Mark ii, 14.) The name was common among the Hebrews.

and Thaddæus, and Simon the Canaanite, 19 and Judas

---

Whether it be but another form of *Clopas* (not *Cleophas*), referred to in John xix, 25, is uncertain. The archetypical Hebrew word *Chalphai*, might readily mould itself in the direction of both poles of pronunciation. But we need not seek to determine. If, however, the *Clopas* of John xix, 25 be Alphæus, then the *Cleopas* of Luke xxiv, 18, must be a different person from *Clopas*, for Luke, as well as Matthew and Mark, uses the form *Alphæus*. (vi, 15; Acts i, 13.) ———*And Thaddæus*: Or *Lebbæus*, as he is called by Matthew, (x, 3). He is otherwise called *Judas* or *Jude* "(the son) of James." (See Luke's Gosp. vi, 16; Acts i, 13.) See also John xiv, 22. He is, as Luther remarks, "the good Judas," *(der fromme Judas)*. It is most probable that *Judas* or *Jude* would be his "proper name." *Lebbæus* or *Thaddæus*—sometimes the one and sometimes the other—would be a kind of characteristic designation or surname. The two words are affiliated as designations,—*Lebbæus* coming from *Leb* (לֵב) the Hebrew and Aramaic for *heart*, and *Thaddæus* from *Thad* the Aramaic for *breast* or *bosom*, (תַּד, Hebrew שַׁד). In the *breast* or *bosom* we have, to a certain extent, the outer development of the *heart*. The *full-breasted* is as it were the *large-hearted*. We know nothing of the ultimate career of this Judas or Jude. He is doubtless to be distinguished from the Judas or Jude, the "servant of Jesus Christ" and "brother of James," who wrote the little epistle that comes after the Epistles of John.———*And Simon the Canaanite*: Or rather, as in the Geneva, the *Cananite*, for there is no reference at all to the people called *Canaanites*. Neither is there any reference, as Luther seemed to think, to the town *Cana*. He translates the expression "Simon of Cana." So do Coverdale, Piscator, Bengel, Zinzendorf. Tyndale has *Symon of Cane*. The evangelist's term, however, is not *Canaite*, but *Cananite*, or better still, and as Edgar Taylor gives it, *Kananite*, or *Cananæan* as it is in the original and as Alford gives it in his Translation. The word is an Aramaic word, signifying *zealot*. And hence it is translated into Greek by Luke, *Zelotes*, (Gosp. vi, 15; Acts i, 13). Norton renders the phrase here, *Simon the Zealot*. The *zealots* were an extreme political party among the Jews,—somewhat corresponding to the Fenians in Ireland,—who were determined on no account to acquiesce in the Roman rule. They were persuaded that any public or private measures or acts, however bloody or revolutionary, which were intended and fitted either to break down or to embarrass the dominion of the Romans, or of any other heathens, within the Holy Land, were not only legitimate, but meritorious. They played in subsequent times a terrible part in connection with the "reign of terror" that preceded the destruction of Jerusalem. (See Josephus's *Wars of the Jews*, from the 4th Book onward.) At the outset of the movement there would most probably be a purer zeal than was afterwards developed. It would be pious as well as patriotic. And no doubt it would be at this comparatively pure stage of things that Simon would get connected with the movement. The diviner zeal, emanating from Jesus, and flowing in the direction of the kingdom of the true Jews, "the kingdom of heaven," would change the current of his life.

VER. 19. *And Judas Iscariot*:—The last and lowest in the list. He would receive the designation *Iscariot* to distinguish him from other Judases in

Iscariot, [l] which also betrayed him. [l] John 14. 22.
And they went [4] into an house. 20 And the [4] Or, *home.*

general, and from Judas Thaddæus or Lebbæus in particular. It is generally supposed that the designation is just *Ish-Kerioth*, meaning literally *man of Kerioth*, or *Keriothite*. Kerioth was an obscure town of Judah, (see Josh. xv, 25); and it is not unlikely that Judas's father Simon had removed from it to Galilee. Hence he too, when once he became a "residenter" in Galilee, would be called *Simon Iscariot*, or *Simon the Keriothite*. And so, indeed, he is called in the text of John vi, 71 and xiii, 26, which is given in the editions of Tischendorf and Tregelles.——*Who also betrayed him* :–Or, *Who also delivered him up*, namely, to those who were thirsting for his blood. It is the black mark on Judas, that differentiates him from the other apostles, and from all other men.—It may be asked, *Why did our Lord choose such a man to be an Apostle?* It is enough, meanwhile, to answer (1.) That as our Lord, for the grandest of purposes, had appeared among men in a peculiar sphere of human society and at a particular time, so the men, whom he chose to be disciples and apostles, *might not be the best that were absolutely imaginable.* They might merely be the best that, in the circumstances, were actually attainable. And then again (2.) there is no good reason for supposing that Judas would be an unprincipled man at the time he was chosen.

*And they went into an house* :–With these words a new brief paragraph commences. *They should have formed part of the 20th verse.* Robert Stephens, the verse-maker, included them in the 20th verse. But unhappily Beza differed in his judgement, and, in his editions, tacked them on to verse 19. So did Henry Stephens in his editions. Our translators, no doubt influenced by their authority, walked in their footsteps. Inconsiderately however. And yet Mill and Wetstein followed. The Elzevirs before them had wavered; in their earlier editions (1624, 1633, and 1641) following Beza and Henry Stephens, but returning in their later editions (1658, 1662, 1670, 1678) to Robert Stephens. Bengel saw that the words belonged to a new paragraph, and he hence commenced a new paragraph with them, but he marked them in his 1734 edition as belonging to verse 19. Afterwards he discovered that they properly belonged to verse 20, and hence in his 1753 edition, and his German version, he not only kept them at the commencement of the new paragraph, but restored them to the 20th verse. Both Zinzendorf and Griesbach commence with them a new paragraph. So did Luther, and Tyndale. So does Ewald. So too did Le Clerc; but he made them *constitute the 19th verse*, having appended the preceding words to the 18th. Lachmann and Tischendorf both commence a new paragraph with the words; but they both mark them as belonging to the 19th verse. Ewald however and Tregelles restore them to the 20th verse; but unhappily Tregelles does not begin with them a new paragraph.—It is not easy to give the words a correct idiomatic translation. The literal translation would be *and they come into house. Come* is the proper word, instead of *go*. The narrator's standpoint is *at the house.* The term is almost always translated *come*. And it is in the present tense,—not *came* or *went*. The narrator has transferred himself back to the time when the events were actually taking place. *Into house* :–Or *to house*, as Coverdale has it; or

multitude cometh together again, [m]so that they could not so much as eat bread. 21 And when his

[m] Chap. 6. 31.

*unto housse*, as Tyndale has it. The phrase is not an English idiom. But the original expression does not mean *into a house*, as Wycliffe has it. Neither does it exactly mean *home*, as in the margin and the Geneva Version. It corresponds to our idiomatic expression *into town*, only it narrows the reference to a particular house. (See on chap. ii, 1.) The meaning is that *in process of time Jesus returns to Capernaum with his disciples, and they go into the house where he was accustomed to live when in that town.* Tischendorf reads, in his 8th edition, not *And 'they come,'* but *And 'he cometh' into house.* He is supported by the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts, and some other considerable authorities. Not unlikely it is the correct reading. But it is implied, of course, that the apostles were with our Lord. See next verse.———Ewald thinks that in Mark's original Gospel, an abstract of *the Sermon on the Mount* would intervene between the words of this clause, and the words of the preceding clause; but that somehow or other it had got dropped out. Hence he interposes between the clauses the signs of a hiatus or gap, (a *Lücke*). It is quite an arbitrary conjecture, founded on quite an arbitrary theory as to what Mark might be expected to record, and what he might be expected to leave unrecorded. But we must take Mark's *Memoirs of our Lord* just as we have them, and be contented with them. They are, indeed, in many respects, semi-detached snatches of biography, artlessly pieced together. But how charming!

VER. 20. *And a crowd cometh together again*:—The excitement, curiosity, and eagerness of the people were still flowing as in spring-tide. Note the *again*. It glances back, not exclusively to what is recorded in chapter ii, 2, but to the many notices of crowds that are contained in the entire preceding narrative.—*A crowd*:—Not "*the* multitude," as in our Authorized Version, and the Rheims. There is no article in the text that was before our translators. And yet in the Alexandrine, Vatican, and Cambridge manuscripts, (A B D), along with a few minor authorities, the article is found, (ὁ ὄχλος). Lachmann and Tregelles have received it into their texts, and so did Tischendorf in his 1849 and 1859 editions: but in his 8th edition he has returned to the reading of the Received Text, for which he has, besides many other authorities, the sanction of the Sinaitic manuscript.———*So that they could not so much as eat bread*:—The expression is peculiarly emphatic, (ὥστε μὴ δύνασθαι αὐτοὺς μήτε ἄρτον φαγεῖν). *Among many other things, less indispensable, which they were not able to do, our Lord and his disciples could not even secure for themselves such a modicum of seclusion and leisure as was needful for their meals.* The people kept thronging in irrepressibly, eager to see, eager to hear, eager to experience or to witness the wonderful effects of the outgoing "virtue."

VER. 21. *And when his friends heard*:—Viz. about what was going on. When reports reached them regarding their kinsman's persisted-in preachings, and his fearless disputings with the ablest and most learned of the scribes and Pharisees, and his actual selection of a band of twelve coadjutors and apostles, —not to mention other rumours of most daring exorcisms and cures. The expression rendered *his friends* has caused perplexity to many critics. Un-

[5] friends heard *of it,* they went out to lay hold on him: [n] for they said, [o] He is beside himself.

[5] Or, *kinsmen.*

[n] John 7. 5.

[o] John 10. 20.

necessarily, however. It literally means *they who were from beside him,* (οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ), that is, in this connection, *they who were by origin or birth from beside him,—they who were 'closely connected' with him by birth.* It is quite an appropriate phrase to denote one's *kinsmen.* So the term is translated in the margin, and by Wycliffe. The Geneva has the corresponding word *kinsfolkes.* Tyndale meant to bring out the same idea when he rendered the expression, *they that longed unto him,* that is, *they that belonged unto him.* Luther missed the mark, and misled Coverdale, when he rendered the phrase *they that were about him, (die um ihn waren).* Wolle however contended for the same translation. *(De Parenthesi Sacra,* p. 33.) And Krebs's rendering is kindred, *they who were with him.* Schöttgen gives the same rendering with Krebs, both in his *Lexicon,* and in his *Horæ Hebraicæ.* It is approved of too by Kocher. All these critics suppose that the phrase refers to our Saviour's *disciples.* Wolf took the same view of the reference, (see his note on verse 31), and Griesbach and Vater. And so too Sir Norton Knatchbull *(Annotations,* in loc.) and Hombergk, *(Parerga,* in loc.), only they interpreted the phrase as meaning *some from him,* that is, *his messengers,* or *they who were sent by him.*———*They went out*:–Or better still, *they came out.* The evangelist's mental standpoint was not at Nazareth, *whence the Saviour's kinsfolk went,* but at Capernaum *whither they came.* If we were to drop his mental standpoint out of view altogether, we might render the verb freely *they set out.*———*To lay hold on him*:–Namely with their hands, that they might take him home, and keep him under family restraint.———*For they said, He is beside himself*:–Literally, *He is standing out (of himself).* He is *out of his senses,* (ἐξέστη). With their small ideas of things, they could not otherwise account for his conduct. The verb translated *they said* is in the imperfect tense, (ἔλεγον); *they kept harping on the matter.*—Many expositors have felt scandalized at the application of such language to our Saviour on the part of his kinsfolk; and, in particular, they have been unable to reconcile themselves to the idea that his mother could allow herself to speak thus of her Son. Hence they have tortured their ingenuity to excogitate some other interpretation. The writer of the very ancient Cambridge manuscript (D) represents the verse thus,—*And when the scribes and the rest heard concerning him, they went out to lay hold of him, for they said, he is driving them mad,* (ἐξίσταται αὐτούς, *exentiat eos!*). The Gothic Version represents the sense thus,—*And scribes and others hearing of him, went out to lay hold of him: they also said that he is out of his senses, (usgaisiths.)* The Italic or Old Latin Version presents a corresponding transformation, swinging in some of its manuscripts to the representation preserved in the Cambridge Codex, and in others to the milder misrepresentation preserved in the Gothic translation. It is evident that some of the old transcribers and translators had been sorely perplexed. So in more modern times. Schöttgen, for instance, though reverently retaining the unexceptionally supported reading of the *Received Text,* puts it on the rack, and extorts from it the following interpretation,—*And when the disciples heard (the crowd tumultuating outside*

22 And the scribes which came down from Jerusalem said,

---

*the door), they went out to restrain it, for they said, It is furious!* Sir Norton Knatchbull, with his characteristic love of the peculiar, gives a corresponding explanation; and Wolle too, in the main. Sir Norton speaks of *the multitude being mad*. Coverdale, again, contented himself with toning down the force of the verb; *He taketh too much upon him*. Grotius, on the other hand, found relief in the other verb, *they said*, or *they were saying*. He thinks that it is used impersonally, *it was said, it was rumoured*. Euthymius Zigabenus had a similar idea, interpreting the phrase thus, *for certain envious persons said, He is beside himself*. Griesbach, again, thinks that Christ had gone out to the crowd, though this is not expressly stated by the evangelist; and he would explain the verse as follows,—*And when they who were with him* (his disciples and other friends), *heard (how he was overexerting himself among the crowd), they went out to bring him in, for (some of the crowd) were saying, He is carried beyond himself, so as to be no longer master of himself*. Vater takes the same view. And still other and equally violent modifications of interpretation have been proposed by other interpreters, more influenced perhaps, as Maldonat observes, by piety than by prudence. Unhappily however. It is by no means needful to suppose that our Lord's kinsfolk understood him, or were careful to avoid all strong expressions in reference to him. (See John vii, 3—10.) Neither is it on the other hand needful to suppose that every one of them, inclusive even of Mary herself, used the very strong phraseology recorded. Nothing is more reasonable, as Maldonat remarks, than to assume a free and easy *syllepsis* or *synecdoche* of representation on the part of the evangelist. And it is, at the same time, quite reasonable to assume that, even to Mary, our Saviour was, in many respects, an Inexplicable Mystery. So doubtless would he have been to *us*, had we had no other light, by means of which to see, than the twilight in which Mary and the "brethren" were walking.

VER. 22. *And*: The evangelist, having in the preceding verse led us in thought from Capernaum to Nazareth, and shown us the departure of the Saviour's kinsfolk on their officious mission, leaves that thread of things, to be afterwards resumed. See verses 31—35. Meantime, and while the kinsfolk are as it were on the road, he introduces us abruptly and artlessly to another scene.———*The scribes who came down from Jerusalem*:-For it would appear that the great ecclesiastics in the capital were feeling uneasy in reference to the Galilean Reformer. He had not got his training at the feet of any of the accredited rabbis, and yet he was already quite a Power in the country. They deemed it prudent therefore to depute some of the ablest of the scribes to go down and make inquisition.—*Down*:-Jerusalem was perched on the summit of a broad mountain ridge. The highest point of the city was more than 2,300 feet above the level of the Mediterranean. Hence people in all parts of the Holy Land spoke of *going up to* Jerusalem, and *coming down from* it.———*Said, He hath Beelzebub*:-Or rather *Beelzebul*. Such is the form of the word in Greek, although unhappily it is *Beelzebub* in the Syriac Peshito and the Latin Vulgate. It was from the latter version that the corrupted form passed into the Anglo-Saxon and the Old English versions, inclu-

*r* He hath *q* Beelzebub, and by the prince of the devils *p* Mat. 9. 34.
Mat. 12. 24. Luke 11. 15. *q* 2 Ki. 2. 2.

---

sive of Wycliffe's; and thence it descended into our Authorized Version. It passed likewise, from the same source, into Luther's German version, and Emser's, Piscator's, and Zinzendorf's; also into the older French versions; and into the Old Dutch version, though it was rectified in the revised version of the Synod of Dort. It passed likewise into Diodati's Italian version, and Martini's. But in Brucioli's Tuscan version a compromise is made between the two forms; or rather, the peculiarity of both the forms is dropped. His word is *Belzebu*. The evangelist's word was no doubt *Beelzebul*, which, however, was an intentional travesty or burlesque of *Beelzebub* or *Baal-zebub*. This latter word was the real name of the tutelary deity of the Ekronites, (2 Kings i, 2, 3, 16), and meant *Fly-Lord*. But the Jews, by the change of a single letter, turned it quaintly into *Filth-Lord*, (See *Com.* on Matt. x, 25); and then, pleased with their own theological pleasantry, they proceeded farther in their grim humour, and applied the name, in its parodied form, to Satan. Hence when the scribes said of our Lord, *He has Beelzebul*, they meant to assassinate his influence with the people, by throwing into their minds the terrible idea that *the devil was in league with him*. (See verse 23.) There is far greater malice in the imputation than Rosenmüller and Kuinöl imagined. They thought that it simply meant *He is mad*. But it is as if they had said,—"He "has got the devil to co-operate with him. Or rather, the devil has got his "co-operation. What wonder, then, that he should do wonderful works, "especially in the demonic direction? It is all a black league and covenant "between the two, to delude men to their destruction!"———*And, By the prince of the demons he casts out the demons*:—Note the connective particle *and*. It is not part of the report. And hence it does not introduce a second clause in the terrible accusation,—leading us to understand that they who said *He has Beelzebul*, immediately added *and by the prince of the demons he casts out the demons*. The repetition of the quotation-particle in the original (the recitative ὅτι after the καί) shows us that the evangelist is recording *two distinct reports*,—although, it is true, they were but different forms or phases of one diabolical accusation. If we were, according to a suggestion of Philippi, to represent ocularly, by means of inverted commas, the power of the quotation-particle, the verse would stand thus,—*And the scribes, who came down from Jerusalem, said, "He has Beelzebul," and, "By the prince of the demons he casts out the demons."* It is Satan of course, or Beelzebul, who is called *the prince* or *ruler of the demons*. (See next verse.) The word translated *prince*, (ἄρχων), is generally rendered *ruler* in the other passages of the New Testament in which it occurs. It is rendered *chief* in Luke xi, 15, and *chief ruler* in John xii, 42. The expression *by the ruler of the demons* is rendered freely by Tyndale, *by the power of the chefe devyll*. It is literally '*in*' *the ruler of the demons*, and represents our Saviour's personality as *merged in* the personality of Satan. The imputation was, that Satan had taken Jesus *into himself*; or, to exhibit the case under a slightly different phase, that he had, as principal, entered into a compact with Jesus, as subordinate. He had entered into this compact, it was insinuated, *for the purpose of putting down the inestimably beneficent influ-*

casteth he out devils. 23 And he called them *unto him*, and said unto them in parables, How can Satan cast out Satan? 24 And if a kingdom be divided against itself, that

---

*ence of the Pharisees! Hence, it was alleged, all the strictures and criticisms of Jesus on the godly ways of the godly people! For success in this Satanic crusade, no stone was to be left unturned! Power was given from beneath, power even to cast out demons, so that the people might be thoroughly deceived!* (As to *demons*, see on chap. i, 34.)

VER. 23. *And he called them unto him*: The horrible imputation was not directly addressed to himself, but to some of the surrounding people. Perhaps it would be elicited in the course of some keen debate which was going on aside. Not unlikely it would at first be only broached in some half-smothered insinuation, gnashed between the teeth. But the Saviour was cognizant of it; and it brought collision to a crisis. Hence he called his accusers to him.——*And said unto them in parables*:—Such as are recorded in verses 24, 25, 27. The argumentative *parables* there recorded are short indeed. Still they are *parables*: for it is not essential to a *parable* that it be a fully developed narration or story. The word means etymologically a *side-throw*. The thing signified by the word is therefore *something thrown by the side of another thing*, it may be *to hide it*, or it may be *to show it off*. The parable is in general some kind of similitude, illustrating by something common, well known, or easily understood, some other thing lying more remote from popular apprehension. It is based on a profound law of correspondences, pervading and binding into harmony the whole universe. Instead of the Greek word *parables*, Tyndale, Coverdale, and the Original Geneva Version of 1557 have the Latin word *similitudes*, which, however, is not quite broad enough to cover the whole expanse of *parables*. (See Luke iv, 23, in the Greek.)——*How can Satan cast out Satan?* This does not mean, as Fritzsche supposed, and Luther and Coverdale before him, *How can one Satan cast out another Satan?* but *How can Satan cast out himself?* (See vers. 24, 25.) When the Saviour says *can*, he does not refer to *physical ability*, as it is called, for it is conceivable, that Satan could, as a mere feat of ability, make a feint of casting out himself. He could cast himself out,—as regards some forms of his indwelling presence or energy, from some individuals in order that he might throw a "glamour" of misconception over the minds of others. Our Saviour is referring, however, to a certain kind of *moral ability*, so-called,—to ability inter-related to consistency of demeanour. *How could it be consistent in Satan to cast out Satan?*

VER. 24. *And*:—The *parables*, referred to in the preceding verse, now come in. But as the argumentative query, which has already been proposed, has really settled the whole question, they are not introduced, as demonstrations, by means of the ratiocinative particle *for*, but are just artlessly linked on, as appended illustrations. Hence the *and*.——*If a kingdom be divided against itself*:—That is, *If it ever happen in any case*—(ἐάν—)—*that it is an accomplished fact that a kingdom is divided* (μερισθῇ) *against itself*. The expression *against itself* is literally *upon itself*, (ἐφ' ἑαυτήν). If part has turned *upon* part with hostile intent. The preposition denotes *motion with a view to superposition*.

kingdom cannot stand. 25 And if a house be divided against itself, that house cannot stand. 26 And if Satan rise up against himself, and be divided, he cannot stand, but hath

---

If each party has sought to come *down upon* the other, so as to *over*-throw it, and keep it *under*.———*That kingdom is not able to stand*:-Note the present tense of the verb, *is not able*, coming after the præterite tense of the preceding clause. If the division in the state is already an accomplished fact, the consequence is not merely *a prospective*, but *a present weakness*, and hence *imminent prostration*. If the parties are well balanced, and the feud be incurable,—two elements in the case that are parabolically assumed,—the kingdom must collapse. For the meaning of the passive verb rendered *to stand*, (σταθῆναι), and correctly so rendered, see Luke xviii, 40; xix, 8; xxi, 36; Acts ii, 14; v, 20; xvii, 22; xxv, 18; xxvii, 21; Rev. vi, 17; viii, 3; xii. 18.

Ver. 25. The Saviour gives another and analogous parable, only shifting his scene to a smaller community. *And if a house be divided against itself, that house is not able to stand*:-The word *house* has, of course, its rarer meaning of *household*, the meaning which it has in John iv, 53 and 1 Cor. xvi, 15. It is translated *household* in Phil. iv, 22. If thorough intestine antagonism be once an accomplished fact in a family, *that* family must be *broken up* and thus *broken down*.

Ver. 26. *And if* (εἰ) *Satan rises up against himself* (ἀνέστη ἐφ' ἑαυτόν):-As is actually the case, *provided the malicious imputation of the scribes be well founded*. It is a most graphic picture. Satan, "himself a host," *rises up* in all the panoply of his might to *put himself down!*———*And has been divided*:-Such is probably the correct reading, (καὶ μεμέρισται). It is the reading of the Received Text, and of Lachmann, Tregelles, Alford. It is supported by the great body of the uncial manuscripts, inclusive of the Alexandrine (A), and by the Peshito Syriac, the Philoxenian Syriac, the Coptic, and Gothic versions. In the Vatican manuscript (B) there is a slight variation of reading. The verb is in another tense,—the aorist instead of the perfect, (ἐμερίσθη),—but the conjunction *and* is retained in front, thus postponing the predicate of the sentence to the next clause. In the Sinaitic manuscript (ℵ*) and the Ephraemi (C*), the verb is in the same tense as in the Vatican, but the conjunction follows the verb, as it also does in the Vulgate version, and in certain important manuscripts of the older Latin. Tischendorf has accepted, in his 8th edition, the reading of the Sinaitic and Ephraemi manuscripts, thus finishing the subject of the sentence with the words, *if Satan rises up against himself*. It is more likely, however, that the subject includes the second clause; and it is also more likely that the verb in this second clause is in the perfect tense. *And has been divided*, that is, *and has thus been divided against himself*, like an embattled host splitting up into two that it might rush into deadly conflict with itself.———*He is not able to stand, but has an end*:-The Saviour's conception of Satan does not confine itself to that of a personality. He pictures him as a power, a principality, a royalty, a kingdom. If, as such, he has been divided against himself, and is thus counterworking himself, and turning all his artillery against himself, *he cannot stand*. His adversative relationship to others is annihilated. *He has an end*.

an end. 27 [r]No man can enter into a strong man's [r] Mat. 12. 29.
house, and spoil his goods, except he will first bind the

---

There is an end of his Satanic influence among men.———The Saviour, in his reasoning on the imputation of the scribes, assumes, and was entitled to assume, that he himself was intensely earnest in the part which he was acting against Satan and sin. He allows this moral earnestness to assert its own reality. It was self-evident, shining by its own light. The unsophisticated *people* did not doubt it, and could not. No one who came near him, and conscientiously watched him, could doubt it in his heart. You might as soon doubt whether God were good. If Jesus be not Nobody and Nothing, he is the Impersonation of anti-Satanic earnestness. "For this purpose the Son of God was manifested *that he might destroy the works of the devil.*" (1 John iii, 8.) If therefore Satan were making a tool of him, as the scribes maliciously insinuated, he was making a tool of the most intense anti-Satanic earnestness in the universe. Was it likely? To suppose it is to suppose that the Adversary of God and of men wilfully chose, and with his eyes wide open, to become his own Adversary and Satan and Apollyon.

VER. 27. *But* (ΑΛΛ): This adversative conjunction is omitted in the *Received Text*, and hence in our *Authorized Version*. It is also omitted in the Vulgate version, and in most of the manuscripts of the Older Latin, and in the Syriac Peshito version, and the text of the Philoxenian Peshito, and in the Gothic version. It is wanting too in the Alexandrine manuscript (A) and the Cambridge (D), and a majority of the other uncials. Lachmann omits it. But Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, have rightly inserted it, on the authority of the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts (ℵ B), and C* L Δ, 1, 33, 69, &c. It is likewise represented in the Coptic and Armenian versions. The Saviour, instead of further pursuing the same line of argumentation, along which he was moving in the preceding verses, *turns in a different direction.*———*No one, after entering into the house of the strong one, is able to plunder his vessels*:- There is much difference of opinion among textual critics regarding the precise order of the phrases and clauses of this part of the parable; but there is none regarding their interpretation. The difference of reading would no doubt arise from the evangelist setting down his expressions inartificially,—more so than they stand in the text which Tischendorf has exhibited in his 8th edition of the New Testament. The picture represents the house of the strong one *as already entered*, (εἰσελθών). The difficulty comes after that. The person, whose house has been entered, is *strong, emphatically strong.* The Saviour thinks of him very individualizingly as '*the*' *strong one.* It would be impossible to plunder such an individual's vessels, if he were standing by unmastered. Note the expression *his* '*vessels,*' rendered freely in our Authorized Version *his goods.* This free rendering was Tyndale's. Wycliffe gave the more exact and significant rendering, *vessels.* It is supposed that the individual who goes into the strong one's house desires to get hold of certain specific things, *the precious vessels of silver and gold.* His eye is upon these particular "goods"; and he thus leaves unregarded all the other goods or effects that may be within the house. The word used for the act of *plundering* is graphic, (διαρπάσαι). It represents a man *discriminatively snatching.*———

strong man; and then he will spoil his house. 28 Verily I say unto you, [s]All sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and blasphemies wherewith soever they

[s] Mat. 12. 31. Lu. 12. 10. 1 John 5. 16.

---

*Unless he have first bound the strong one*: *Bound*, or otherwise got rid of. The Saviour, however, is contemplating a particular case in which riddance by transportation or death must not be thought of. He allows the reality, which he is parabolically representing, to mould and modify the form of his parable. He was thinking of Satan, who had his home in this world before man appeared, and who, besides, was constituted immortal because he was constituted moral. His transportation, therefore, or annihilation was not to be thought of. But, as he had surrounded himself unlawfully with certain precious vessels, which were fitted to be of "honourable" use in a much greater "house" than his, it was meet that he should be *bound*, and then deprived of his ill-gotten "goods." Jesus had come to bind him; and he had succeeded, evén already, in his enterprise. Satan was restrained, and men were being delivered. That was the true significancy of those wonderful miracles which gave relief to demoniacs.———*And then shall he plunder his house*:–*Then*, viz. after he shall have bound the strong one. The evangelist mingles his lines of thought inartificially, but clearly. Hence the appendage of this categorical clause to the former hypothetical clause. Note the two expressions *plunder his house* and *plunder his vessels*. Both representations are true to nature. The plundering takes effect, though diversely, both upon the house—*the object containing*, and upon the vessels in the house—*the objects contained*.

Ver. 28. Our Saviour follows up his reasonings with a solemn warning.———*Verily I say unto you*:–This is the first time that the adverb *amen* or *verily* occurs in Mark. It seems to have been, in its original Hebrew form, a favourite phrase with our Lord, when he wished to give emphasis to an idea. It is rendered *trewly* by Wycliffe. In the Rheims Version, as in the Gothic and Vulgate, the original term is left untranslated, just as it is in the text of the evangelist himself. It corresponds to the expression *of a truth*. See John vi, 14; Acts iv, 27; x, 34.—*I say to you*:–That is, *to you scribes, who have been so wantonly maligning me, by alleging that I am acting in league with Beelzebul.*———*All (things) shall be forgiven to the sons of men*:–The expression *all* is looking forward to the classified things which are immediately specified. It has reference therefore to a limited universality,—the universality of a certain class of things. They are such things as need forgiveness—sins. All these—with one exception—*shall be forgiven to the sons of men*. Note the *shall*. It expresses more than *may*, though *may* might have been employed. It suggests that there is but one phase of sin that is an absolute bar to forgiveness. It is at one point of things alone that the principle of unpardonableness comes in. The multiplicity of sins becomes merged as it were in the unity of sinfulness. And when this unity of sinfulness is free from a certain peculiar element, about to be specified, *it 'shall' be forgiven*. (See *Com.* on Matt. xii, 31.) Note the expression *sons of men*. It is a mere variation, in form, of the simpler expression *men*. (See Matt. xii, 31, and compare the Syriac idiom.)———*The sins and the blasphemies, wherewith they may have blasphemed*, (τὰ ἁμαρτήματα

shall blaspheme: 29 but he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of

---

καὶ αἱ βλασφημίαι, ὅσα ἂν βλασφημήσωσιν, the correct reading):—The preceding *all* has reference both to the generic *sins* and the specific *blasphemies;* and when it is added '*wherewith*' *they may have blasphemed,* the *wherewith* (ὅσα with ℵ B D E G H Δ Π, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, not ὅσας as in the Received Text) has condensed reference to the generic *sins* as well as to the specific *blasphemies.* If the reference had been unfolded, the expression would have run thus, *the sins wherein they may have sinned, and the blasphemies wherewith they may have blasphemed.* The phraseology is inartificial; but a deep theological meaning is imbedded. It is implied that all sins, when analyzed into their substrate, have an element of *blasphemy* in them. They cast dishonour on God. They cast it wilfully. Blasphemy, considered in its form, is *injurious speaking.* But, considered in its essence, it is *despite* or *scorn.* In all sin there is such essential blasphemy. God's wish and will are proudly set aside and resisted. All such proud resistances of the wish and will of God will be forgiven, if they do not culminate in a particular phase of blasphemy. See next verse.

Ver. 29. *But whosoever may have blasphemed against the Holy Spirit*:—Whosoever may have been guilty of blasphemy that goes out *to* (εἰς) the Holy Spirit. What of him? See next clause. But meanwhile note that the peculiarity of his crime arises from its relation to the dispensation of Mercy. It is the only crime which, in its own nature, closes the door of the soul, and keeps it closed, against the ingress of Divine Mercy. The Holy Spirit is the Revealer of the propitiousness of God, and when, as such, he is blasphemed, or scorned, or slighted, the only possible means of the soul's acquaintance with the Mercy of God is set aside or resisted. The only avenue to salvation and sanctification is thus closed. Augustin was right,—the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is wilfully persisted-in impenitence or disbelief. (See *Com.* on Matt. xii, 31, 32.)———*Hath never forgiveness*:—A free but fine translation. It was Coverdale's. It is more literal than Tyndale's, *shall never have forgeveneş.* The Rheims version is more literal still, *he hath not forgiveness for ever.* The expression *for ever* is literally *to the age,* (εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα). It is an idiom, and substantially means, as Alexander renders it, *to eternity.* And hence a peculiar symphony between this clause and the next.———*But is in danger of eternal damnation*:—A strong translation of an incorrect text. The text was that of Erasmus; the translation was Tyndale's. It is to be borne in mind, however, that the word *damnation* meant originally nothing but *condemnation.* And such undoubtedly was the import of the term in Tyndale's version. The Greek word, indeed, in the text that was lying before him, strictly meant *judgement,* (κρίσεως); and so Coverdale here renders it. But as *judgement* is in itself ambidextrous, left-hand judgement is *condemnation.* The word, however, which Tyndale found in his Erasmian text, was really a marginal correction of the word that was in the evangelist's autograph, and which Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, have wisely restored,—the word *sin,* (ἁμαρτήματος). Griesbach, in his day, saw clearly that the reading of the Erasmian text was a critical correction. (*Com. Crit.* in loc.) Mill too. (*Pro-*

eternal damnation: 30 because they said, He hath an unclean spirit.

---

*legomena*, p. xliii.) The case is obvious. No one would have substituted, for perspicuity's sake, the expression *everlasting sin* for the expression *everlasting judgement* or *condemnation*. But many a critic might think that he was only innocently smoothing a rugged phrase when he quietly introduced *judgement* or *condemnation* for *sin*. Both the Vatican and the Sinaitic manuscript (B ℵ, as well as "the queen of the cursives" (33), read *sin*. So do the Italic, Vulgate, Coptic, Armenian, and Gothic versions. Instead, then, of the expression *is in danger of eternal damnation*, we should read *is guilty of an everlasting sin*. As to the word which we have translated *guilty*, (ἔνοχος), see its use in 1 Cor. xi, 27, and James ii, 10. It denotes that the person spoken of is *in the grip of his sin*. It has *hold* of him, and *holds* him *in*, so that he cannot escape from the punishment that is his due. As to the expression *everlasting sin*, it is peculiar, and in some respects unique, but thoroughly intelligible. It denotes a sin that cannot be *taken away*, *blotted out*, or *cleansed*. Griesbach compares John ix, 41, '*your sin remaineth*.' An *everlasting sin* is *a sin that remaineth for ever*. Forgiven sins are sins that are taken up by God from the burdened conscience of the sinner and cast, as it were, "behind His back" or "into the depths of the sea." But unforgiven sins abide for ever on the soul that committed them. The language is, of course, strongly pictorial, but finely and solemnly significant.

VER. 30. *Because they said*:—They *persisted in saying*, (ἔλεγον). Our Saviour addressed to the scribes his solemn warning, *because* they were persisting in their malign and wanton allegation.———*He hath an unclean spirit*:—That is, *a demon*. They could not deny that his works were supernatural. But instead of admitting that they were from above, and full of divine mercy to men, they wilfully, casuistically, and malignantly accused him of being voluntarily assisted from beneath. He does not intimate to them, as Petter and many others suppose, that they had thereby blasphemed the Holy Spirit and committed the unpardonable sin. Neither does Mark, as Köstlin imagines, confound the two blasphemies, (*die βλασφημία τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου ausdrücklich in die Lästerung der Person Jesu selbst gesetzt.*—URSPRUNG DER SYN. EVV. iii, §. 1). But our Lord intimates to his slanderers that they were treading close on the borders of the sin that hath never forgiveness. They were on its brink. Another step, and they might topple irretrievably into the abyss. They were malevolently rejecting and thus blaspheming the Son of man as an Impostor. If they should proceed the least degree farther and malevolently reject and blaspheme the Holy Spirit also as an Impostor, and his testimony as an imposition, their salvation would become an impossibility. It was within the limits of possibility to reject Jesus of Nazareth and yet believe in a Propitiator to come, as revealed by the Holy Spirit of God. But if they proceeded to reject the Holy Spirit Himself, and all his revelations of the Divine Propitiousness, they would thereby reject every possible element of divine evangelism, and hence there would no avenue remain by which saving and sanctifying influences could enter their souls. (See *Com.* on Matt xii, 31, 32.)

31 [t] There came then his brethren and his mother, and, standing without, sent unto him, calling him. [t] Mat. 12. 46. Lu. 8. 19.

---

Ver. 31. The evangelist, having left, as it were, the Saviour's kinsfolk on the road between Nazareth and Capernaum (see verse 21), rejoins them on their arrival. Hence the paragraph, verses 31—35. Compare Matt. xii, 46—50, and Luke viii, 19—21.———*There come then his brethren and his mother*:—Or rather, according to the reading of the best manuscripts, inclusive of ℵ B C D G L Δ, *his mother and his brethren*. That too, is the order that is observed in the Italic, Vulgate, Syriac Peshito, Coptic, Æthiopic, and Gothic versions. The *mother* is put last in the Erasmian Text that she might be shaded off behind the *brethren*. Tischendorf, however, goes too far when he reads, chiefly on the authority of the Sinaitic manuscript—'*comes*' instead of '*come*,' (ἔρχεται). The singular verb had doubtless got into some manuscripts, by mistake, on account of the proximity of the singular nominative, *his mother*. Tischendorf also reads, in his 8th edition, '*And*' instead of '*Then*,' (καὶ instead of οὖν). In this reading, Lachmann, Tregelles, Alford agree with him. It is supported by the same manuscripts and versions which read *his mother and his brethren* instead of *his brethren and his mother*. It is probably the correct reading,—being more inartificial than the resumptive *then*. There is, however, a subjacent reference to what is mentioned in verse 21. The *brothers of our Lord* were probably, as we have remarked on verse 18, the sons of Joseph by a previous marriage. Thus would they be only our Lord's half-brothers-in-law, not his uterine brothers or half-brothers. They would hence be considerably older than our Lord, and would thus very likely think themselves both qualified and entitled to exercise some peculiar guardianship and authority over their youthful and unintelligible kinsman. Their names are given in chap. vi, 3.———*And, standing outside, sent to him, calling him*:—At the time when they arrived, our Lord was in some house, surrounded with a crowd of people. The very doorway was packed full. There was no way of access for his solicitous kinsfolk. (Luke viii, 19.) Hence they sent in a message, by word of mouth, conveying their desire that he should then and there come out to them, as they wished to speak with him. (Matt. xii, 47.)

Ver. 32. *And a crowd was sitting round about him*: In a "squat" position, after the usual oriental fashion, though not unlikely the outer margin of the throng might consist of persons who would be standing on their feet, and leaning forward to hear and to see.———*And they say to him*: Such is the best reading, instead of *and they 'said' to him*. It is the reading of ℵBCDLΔ, 13, 69, and of the Vulgate version, and the Syriac Peshito, and the Coptic and Æthiopic, (καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ). We are led in spirit into the assembly, and see and hear as if we had been really present. One would whisper the message to another, and it would be transmitted round and round even while our Saviour was speaking. At length at some pause or break in the discourse, some one would muster courage to repeat it aloud. (See Matt. xii, 47.)——— *Lo thy mother and thy brothers outside are seeking thee*:—They are outside, and have come hither in quest of thee. After the clause *and thy brothers*, Tischendorf adds *and thy sisters*, under the authorization of the Alexandrine and Cambridge manuscripts (A D), as also of E F H M S U V Γ. But it is omitted

32 And the multitude sat about him, and they said unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren without seek for thee. 33 And he answered them, saying, Who is my mother, or my brethren? 34 And he looked round about on them which sat about him, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren! 35 For whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and my sister, and mother.

---

in ℵ B C G K L Δ Π, 1, 33, 69, and by the Vulgate, Syriac Peshito, Coptic, Æthiopic, and Armenian versions. It is not unlikely that the clause had been originally inserted in the margin by some annotator who drew, with too great confidence, a historical inference from the doctrinal statement of verse 35.

VER. 33. *And he answered them, saying, Who is my mother and my brethren?*–A question intended to lead his auditory to a very lofty standpoint of thought. Perhaps they had been already ascending with him, and were more or less prepared to step still farther aloft. Most likely he had been discoursing on some high topic. Possibly at the very time the message was delivered he may have been reaching the climax of some grand exhibition of the spiritual relationships of men, and of the superiority of these relationships to mere outward ties of contiguity or consanguinity. Hence he would not allow the exhibition of his great theme to be materially interrupted by the officiousness of his kinsfolk. On the contrary he seizes hold of their meddling message to illustrate the great principle he had in hand or at heart.

VER. 34. *And he looked round about upon those who were sitting around him in a circle*:–Such is the literal translation of the text as it stands in the texts of Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, (περιβλεψάμενος τοὺς περὶ αὐτὸν κύκλῳ καθημένους). It is supported by the uncial manuscripts ℵ B C L Δ. ———*And says, Lo my mother and my brethren!*–My nearest of kin! See next verse.

VER. 35. *For whosoever shall do the will of God, he is my brother and sister and mother*:–A great preponderance of the best manuscripts omit the *my* before the word *sister*. Such is the reading of the Sinaitic, Alexandrian, Vatican, and Cambridge manuscripts (ℵ A B D), as also of L Δ and 1, 33—"the queen of the cursives," and 69. If any one do the will of God, and be thus Godlike and good in character, holy and whole in spirit, in him does the Saviour recognize, in relation to himself, the source of all true kinship. He is at once his "brother and sister and mother." The deepest affinity is that of the spirit. Hence the supremacy, even in the present provisional state of things, of the wedlock relationship. Hence too the still higher supremacy of the relationship that will rule in the world of glory. (Matt. xxii, 30.) It is noteworthy that Jesus does not add "father" to his "brother and sister and mother." A high and hallowed consciousness kept back that august term. He realized that his relation to his real and only *Father* towered far aloft above all other relations.

## CHAPTER IV.

*Jesus teaches the people by the sea of Galilee in parables,* 1, 2. *The parable of the sower,* 3—9. *The disciples ask the meaning of it,* 10. *Jesus explains why he spake to the people in parables, and then he explains the meaning of that parable in particular,* 11—20. *A parabolic apophthegm regarding the use of light,* 21—23. *Parabolic counsel regarding what we should hear,* 24, 25. *The parable of the seed growing spontaneously,* 26—29. *The parable of the mustard seed,* 30—32. *He spake other parables,* 33, 34. *On going to the other side of the lake of Gennesaret, a storm is encountered, and our Lord calms it when he is awakened,* 35—41.

AND he began [a] again to teach by the [b] sea side: and there was gathered unto him a great multitude, so that he entered into a [c] ship, and sat in the sea; and the whole multitude was by the sea on the land.

[a] Chap. 2. 13.
[b] Mat. 13. 1.
[c] Chap. 3. 9.

---

## CHAPTER IV.

HERE follows one of the most graphic of illustrative stories, *the parable of the sower,*—verses 1—20. Compare Matthew xiii, 1—23, and Luke viii, 4—15.

VER. 1. *And again he began to teach by the sea side*:—By the side of the lake of Gennesaret, the lovely "sea of Galilee." It was *again* that he *began*. He had taught by the same place before. See chapter iii, 7—9.———*And there is gathered unto him a very great crowd*: No sooner had he gone to the shore, and begun his teaching, than the people came pouring toward him from all directions. There was *a very great crowd*, (ὄχλος πλεῖστος). Such is the reading of Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, instead of the reading of the Received or Erasmian text, *a great crowd*, (ὄχλος πολύς). The same important manuscripts (ℵ B C L Δ), which support the *superlative* reading, have the verb in the present tense, *is gathered*, (συνάγεται). We are taken back in imagination to the time referred to, and see the people in the very act of congregating. ——*So that he entered into a ship*:—Or, better, *into a boat*. Such is Wycliffe's translation, *in to a boot*.———*And sat in the sea, and all the crowd were* (ἦσαν) *by the sea on the land*:—Some might be sitting on the beautiful "white beach," some standing. The Great Rabbi, however, according to the universal custom of the rabbis, *sat* as he taught. He *sat* '*in the sea*.' The boat, in which he sat, was *afloat in the sea*. If the place referred to was near Bethsaida, there "the beach rises rapidly," says Mr. Macgregor, "and there is deep water "within a few yards of the shore, while at the same time a multitude of "hearers could place themselves so as to see the Saviour in the boat; and

2 And he taught them many things by [d]parables, and said unto them in his doctrine, 3 [e]Hearken; [f]Behold, there went out a sower to sow: 4 and it came to pass, as he sowed, some fell by the way side, and the fowls of the air came and devoured it up. 5 And some fell on stony ground, where it had not much earth; and immediately it sprang up, because it had no depth of earth.

[d] Chap. 3. 23. Mat. 13. 3.
[e] Vers. 9, 23.
[f] Lu. 8. 5.

---

"there is no such *natural church* along the other coast by Gennesareth." (*The Rob Roy on the Jordan*, p. 350.)

VER. 2. *And he taught them many things in parables*:-The *things* were conveyed to them 'in' parables (ἐν παραβολαῖς); and thus they were partly revealed and partly concealed. (See verses 10—12.) Parables are not direct representations of realities, but indirect. What they directly represent is *thrown* in the direction of something that lies beyond. (See on chap. iii, 23.) ———*And said to them in his doctrine*:-Or, better far, as regards our modern idiom at least, *in his teaching*. The word employed is just the noun-form of the verb that is rendered *taught* in the preceding clause, (διδαχῇ—ἐδίδασκεν). Wycliffe has *teaching*, or, as he spells it, *techynge*.

VER. 3. *Hearken; Behold, the sower went out to sow*:-It is '*the*' *sower* in the original. The Saviour casts upon the canvas of the imagination a particular individual. This individual *went out* to sow. He went out from the village or hamlet, where the farmers in the east are accustomed to reside, duly furnished for his work.

VER. 4. *And it came to pass, as he sowed*:-Or, still more literally, *and it happened in the sowing. It happened* is Coverdale's translation. Tyndale's Version is, *it fortuned.*———*Some fell by the way side*:-On the margin of the hard-trodden pathway that ran along, or as the case might be, right through, the unenclosed field.———*And the fowls of the air came*:-Literally, *the winged creatures of the heaven*, (τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ). But there is reason to believe that the expression *of the heaven* has been added out of Luke (viii, 5), or out of the common idiom, (see Matt. vi, 26; viii, 20; xiii, 32; Acts x, 12; xi, 6). It is wanting in the best manuscripts (ℵ A B C L Δ Π), and is left out by Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles. In that case, it will be better to substitute for *fowls* Wycliffe's word, *birds*, or *briddis* as he gives it.——— *And devoured it*:-The original word (κατέφαγεν) is just '*de'-voured* or *ate down*. "Our horses," says Dr. W. M. Thomson on a certain occasion, in his eastern travels, "are actually trampling down some seeds which have fallen by this way-side, and larks and sparrows are busy picking them up." (*The Land and the Book*, p. 82.)

VER. 5. *And other fell on stony ground*:-Or rather, *on the rocky part*, (ἐπὶ τὸ πετρῶδες). Our Saviour imagines a field with a particular rocky part protruding slightly here and there above the general level of the ground, or else revealing itself to the tread as lying immediately below the surface. This is '*the*' *rocky part*. It is not expected by the farmer that anything sown upon it will come to full maturity. But the place comes within his sweep, as he sows the grain, and so some seeds fall upon it.———*Where it had not much earth*:-For it is not of a *stony* place, properly so called, but of a place that is

6 But when the sun was up, it was [g]scorched; and [g] Jas. 1. 11.
because it had no root, it withered away. 7 And some fell
among thorns, and the thorns grew up, and [h]choked [h] Heb. 6. 8.
it, and it yielded no fruit. 8 And other fell on [i]good [i] Heb. 6. 7.
ground, and did yield fruit that sprang up and increased;
and brought forth, some thirty, and some sixty, and some an

---

*rocky*, that the Saviour speaks.———*And immediately it sprang up because it had no depth of earth* :–Or, *because of not having depth of earth*. There was no scope for development downward, and hence the forces of the plant rushed prematurely upward.

VER. 6. *And when the sun arose, it was scorched* :–*Scorched*, a fine translation, originated by the editors of the Authorized Version. The former translators did not hit on a felicitous rendering. Wycliffe has, *it welwide* (i. e. *welled*) *for heete*. Tyndale has, *it caught heat*, and so Coverdale and the Geneva. The Rheims has, *it parched*.———*And, on account of not having root, it withered away* :–It *had not sufficient root*. Its supplies beneath were not sufficient to sustain it in the process of a complete upward development.

VER. 7. *And other fell among thorns* :–Or, more literally, *into the thorns*, such namely as our Saviour was *realizing in his picture of the field*. He was thinking of some clump of thorny plants which had been burnt down according to oriental custom, but not eradicated, before seed-sowing time. In among these roots some seeds fell.———*And the thorns grew up* :–Or *sprang up*, as the same word is rendered in Matt. xiii, 7. But the original term is more generic than either *growing* or *springing*. It simply denotes *ascending*, (ἀνέβησαν).———*And choked it* :–Or, as Wycliffe renders it, *strangled it*. The thorns suffocated the growing plant, compressing it together (συνέπνιξαν), and thus preventing it from getting the free air of heaven, and a sufficiency of the nourishment of the soil.———*And it yielded no fruit* :–Or still more literally, as Wycliffe has it, *and it gave not fruyt*. It rose high enough in its stem,—perhaps too high ; but it was by the help of artificial props. The tide of vital energy was so impoverished by the surroundings, that the real final end of the plant's existence was never reached. There was no "fruit."

VER. 8. *And others fell on good ground* : Or rather, *into the good ground*, (εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν καλήν). In some important manuscripts (ℵ B C L, 33), there is in this clause the plural word *others* (ἄλλα), instead of the singular *other* (ἄλλο), which is found in verses 5 and 7. Tischendorf has introduced it into his 8th edition of the text.———*And yielded fruit that sprang up and increased* :–Or, more literally, *and yielded fruit ascending and increasing*. Meyer thinks that the word *fruit* denotes here, not *the grains*, but *the stalks* of the corn, which conspicuously *ascend* and *increase*. He was misled by thinking of *the disintegrated grains (Körner)*, instead of the entire *spikes*, the *ascent* and *increase* of which are obvious and beautiful phenomena. That the reference is to *the grains in the integer of the spike* is demonstrated by *v.* 20. Compare Matt. xiii, 8, and Luke viii, 8.———*And bore to thirty and to sixty and to a hundredfold* :–Such is the literal translation of the true text, (καὶ ἔφερεν εἰς τριάκοντα καὶ εἰς ἑξήκοντα καὶ εἰς ἑκατόν). It is the text that is given by Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Alford, supported by the manuscripts ℵ B C L Δ.

hundred. 9 And [j] he said unto them, He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.

10 [k] And when he was alone, they that were about him with the twelve asked of him the parable.

[j] Mat. 11. 15. Lu. 14. 35. Rev. 2. 7.

[k] Mat. 13. 10.

---

It could not well be accounted for unless it had been in the original autograph. The reading of the Received Text (ἐν for εἰς) seems to have been artificially accommodated, as Tischendorf remarks, to the mode of expression in Matt. xiii, 8.—The various degrees of fertility specified by our Lord were nothing extraordinary in such a paradise of a place as the plain of Gennesaret. "Its fertility," says Dr. Robinson, "can hardly be exceeded." (*Biblical Researches*, vol. iii, p. 285.)

VER. 9. *And he said*:—The Erasmian text adds the words *unto them*, but without the support of any good authorities whatsoever, whether manuscripts or versions. All the critical editors omit them, inclusive of Bengel, Griesbach, and Scholz.———*He who has ears to hear, let him hear*:—Calvin, Petter, a-Lapide, and others, think that our Saviour assumes a distinction among men, between *those who have ears*—that is, ears fit to listen to divine communications,—and *those who have none*. It is much more probable, however, that he assumes that all without exception have been divinely provided with fitting organs of hearing; and that he draws attention to the fact of the provision, in a way that is calculated to lead each individual to reflect on his individual responsibility. It is quite a common phenomenon among men to misuse the ears, so as not to hear the still small voices that speak the most important truths. In a world like ours, in which there is such a din of noises and voices, there must be eclecticism in hearing.

VER. 10. *And when he came to be alone*:—Not indeed absolutely *alone*, but relatively to the public crowd who had pressed down to the shore to see and hear. *When he got into comparative seclusion.*———*They who were about him with the twelve*:—No doubt there would be frequently in the presence of our Lord other attached disciples besides the apostles; the pious women for instance, and occasionally the relatives and acquaintances both of them and of the apostles; and others besides. It is only Mark who here takes notice of these other adherents. (Compare Matt. xiii, 10; Luke viii, 9.) It is one of the minute touches which show that he was not writing a compendium of either of the other Synoptic Gospels.———*Asked him the parable*:—That is, *interrogated him concerning the import of the parable*, or, as Wycliffe gives it, *axiden hym for to expowne the parable*. Such is the import of the Received Text. It is the reading of Lachmann; and it is found in the Alexandrine manuscript, and a majority of the other uncials, as also in the Clementine Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, and the Gothic, Armenian, and Coptic Versions. It is certainly the easiest reading; and in this instance it is, most probably, the correct reading. A preponderance indeed of the more important manuscripts (ℵ B C L Δ), supported by some important manuscripts of the Vulgate, inclusive of the *Codex Amiatinus*, read, in the plural, *parables* (τὰς παραβολάς), instead of *parable*. Tischendorf in consequence, and Tregelles and Alford, have introduced the plural word into their texts. But it is probable that it owes its place in the codices, from which they copy, to the use of the plural word in the 11th verse.

11 And he said unto them, [l]Unto you it is given to know the mystery of the kingdom of God: but unto them that are [m]without, all *these* things are done in parables: 12 [n]that seeing they may see,

[l] Mat. 13. 11. Luke 8. 10.
[m] Col. 4. 5. 1 Thes. 4. 12. 1 Tim. 3. 7.
[n] Isai. 6. 9. John 12. 40. Acts 28. 27.

---

VER. 11. *And he said to them, Unto you the mystery of the kingdom of God has been given*:—Such is probably the correct reading, (ὑμῖν τὸ μυστήριον δέδοται τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ). The *Received Text* seems to have been modelled on the fuller form of expression that is found both in Matthew (xiii, 11) and in Luke (viii, 10). But the verb *to know* is not found in the manuscripts ℵ A B C K L Π, and it is hence omitted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford. The idea, however, is the same in both forms,—only in Mark's representation the reader is left to determine in what respect "the mystery has been given" to the disciples. It "has been given" to them *as the 'subjects' of knowledge*.—The *mystery* of the kingdom of God is its *secret*, or *the sum of its secrets*. It is that inner reality of spiritual things which the masses of the Jews did not like to think of, and which had therefore to be veiled when it was spoken of in their presence. The same inner reality of things, though under other phases, is still an object of aversion to the masses of men, rich and poor, high and low, learned and illiterate. When an approach is made to an esoteric exhibition of it, symptoms of impatience and dislike are speedily encountered, so that the object must be shaded off exoterically as *a secret* or *mystery*. It is not in any peculiar respect *an incomprehensibility*, although no doubt in its heights it ascends, and in its depths it descends, into incomprehensibilities enough.———*But to them who are without*: Who are outside the circle of discipleshood. The phrase was frequently used by the Jews to denote *the Gentiles*. But it was also applicable, according to the specific standpoint occupied, to all who did not gravitate toward any given centre of attraction. ———*All the things take place in parables*:—The phrase *all the things* (τὰ πάντα), or indefinitely, *all things* (πάντα), as Tischendorf, under the authority of the Sinaitic and a few other manuscripts, has it, refers to the universality that is found within the circle of the Saviour's teachings at that particular period. His teachings to the masses of the people took the shape of parables. Why? See next verse.

VER. 12. *That seeing they may see and not perceive*:—Or, *In order that looking they may look and not see*: The verb in the Hebraistic expression, *looking they may look*, is translated *look* in Matt. v, 28; John xiii, 22; Acts iii, 4; 2 John 8. It is here used to denote that exercise of *the beholding faculty* which stops short of perfected perception. The Hebraistic expression draws attention to a process, involving a progress which should culminate in a completed result. The result, however, is not reached. *They do not see.* And Jesus did not wish them, at that particular stage of things, to *see*. The parables were spoken in order that (ἵνα) they should not "see." Why? Was it because he did not wish them *to know* and *to enjoy?* Every thing the reverse. But he was aware that, in consequence of the inveteracy of their prepossessions, they could not, in the first instance, *see* "the secret of the kingdom" without being repelled in spirit, and confirmed in their

and not perceive; and hearing they may hear, and not understand; lest at any time they should be converted, and *their* sins should be forgiven them.

13 And he said unto them, Know ye not this parable?

---

dissent and dislike. He wished, therefore, that they should not "see." But at the same time he graciously wished that they should "look," and keep "looking," so that they might, if possible, get such a glimpse of the inner glory as might fascinate their interest and attention, and by and by disarm their prejudices, so that they might with safety be permitted to "see."——*And hearing they may hear and not understand*:—A parallel representation, drawn from another of the outward senses. The Saviour wished that the deeply prejudiced multitude should not "understand," in the first instance, the fulness of his ideas, but that yet they should "hear," and continue to "hear." If what they "heard" were in itself fitted to stimulate interest and inquiry, and also adapted, when once inquiry was excited, to guide the mind toward the right goal, it might ultimately lead on to the most important secrets of the kingdom of heaven.——*Lest at any time they should be converted*:—Or rather, *lest they should ever turn*. The verb is in the active voice, (ἐπιστρέψωσιν), and thus brings into view the important truth that the sinner's own agency is an indispensable element in his conversion. When it is said '*lest*' *they should turn*, the "lest" expresses the idea of aversion; and the question naturally arises, *in whose mind is the aversion to the turning?* Is it in the Saviour's (and God's), or in that of the sinner himself? The sentence is so inartificially constructed that, unless common sense step in as interpreter, one might suppose that it was the Saviour who was opposed to the sinner's conversion. It is manifestly however, the sinner himself. It is implied in the preceding clauses that it is the sinner's *deeply-rooted wish* that he should not "see" and "understand." And in this expression the reason of his wish is given. *He is afraid lest he should be prevailed on to turn*. Compare Matt. xiii, 15, and also John xii, 40, and Acts xxviii, 27.——*And it should be forgiven to them*, (καὶ ἀφεθῇ αὐτοῖς): In the *Received Text* the expression *the sins*, that is, *their sins*, is incorporated, *and their sins should be forgiven to them*. The supplement brings out exactly the idea of the original phrase; but it is not unlikely that it was exegetically added. It is omitted by Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, under the sanction of ℵ B C L, and 1. The people spoken of would not be averse to *forgiveness*, abstractly considered,—though there are some that profess to wish simple justice and no favour. But, in the case of most, it is the moral antecedents, and in particular the moral consequents of forgiveness that are disliked. In explicitly shrinking from these, they implicitly shrink from the involved forgiveness itself.

Ver. 13. *And he says to them*:—This expression indicates that another thread of thought is taken up in what immediately follows. Note the present *says*. We are carried back in imagination, and can ourselves listen.——*Ye know not this parable?*—So we may translate this clause, imparting to it, but only by the peculiarity of intonation, a very slight degree of interrogation. Fritzsche, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Ewald, postpone the interrogation-point altogether till the close of the verse. But manifestly the clause is not an

and how then will ye know all parables? 14 The sower soweth the word. 15 And these are they by the way side, where the word is sown; but when they have heard [a] Satan cometh immediately, and taketh away the

[a] 1 Pet. 5. 8. Rev. 12. 9.

absolute negation, as is obvious from the conjunction *and* which introduces the succeeding clause. That succeeding clause is the interrogation proper; but this, though inartificially prefixed, has likewise something interrogatory oozing out. It expresses, at the same time, something of surprise, and something of reproof. *Ye know not this parable! Is that the case? And yet ye have had such advantages! Are ye so slow in learning? Have ye such difficulty in getting to the standpoint from which the whole expanse of these spiritual truths is seen?* The particular parable referred to is that concerning which the disciples had made particular inquiry (verse 10) -the parable of the sower.———*And how shall ye know all the parables?*-The language at the beginning of the clause is abrupt,—*and how?* that is, *and how, if that be the case?* or, as our Authorized Translators interpretatively render it, *and how then?* Tyndale in his 1534 edition has *how then*, but without the preliminary *and*. In his 1526 edition he inserted the *and*, but omitted the *then*. Note the future expression *shall ye know?* It implies an intended order in the parables referred to. The order is such that the mind should commence with the consideration of the first, and thence proceed, *in the future*, to the remainder. The Saviour does not refer to *all possible parables*. His expression is not *all parables*, but *all the parables*, (πάσας τὰς παραβολάς). Very probably, however, he may refer, not only to those which he delivered before he retired from the multitude to whom he spoke the parable of the sower, but also to such as he might deem it proper to deliver on future occasions in reference to the Kingdom of heaven.

VER. 14. **The Saviour explains the parable of the sower.** ———*The sower sows the word*:-The sower in the parable represents *the preacher of the word*. The Holy Spirit is the Great Preacher,—the Holy Spirit in Jesus, or in those who are filled out of the fulness of Jesus. All ordinary preachers have but to echo the preaching of the Holy Spirit. It is to them however, in particular, that the Saviour refers. The *word* which they preach, if they preach as they ought to preach, is just *the manifested thought* of the Holy Spirit, his thought concerning God, and goodness, and the way back for sinners at once to goodness and to God. This *manifested thought* is *the Gospel*.

VER. 15. *And these are they by the way-side, where the word is sown*:-The demonstrative *these* points forward to those who are about to be described in the remainder of the verse. But as the Saviour has them already in his eye while he is speaking, he introduces the next clause by means of the conjunction *and*.—There is *a way-side* in the place "where the word is sown." There is, that is to say, a class of people *who correspond to the way-side* in the parabolic field. Who are they? See what follows.———*And whenever they have heard, immediately Satan cometh, and taketh away the word which has been sown in their hearts*:-Instead of the expression *in their hearts*, Tischendorf (8th ed.) reads *in them*, and Tregelles *into them*. The former has the support of the Sinaitic, the latter that of the Vatican manuscript. It is probable that one

word that was sown in their hearts. 16 And these are they likewise which are sown on stony ground; who, when they have heard the word, immediately receive it with gladness; 17 and have no [p]root in themselves, and so endure [q]but for a time. Afterward, when affliction or persecution ariseth for the word's sake, immediately

[p] Job 19. 28.
[q] Job 27. 10.

or other of the readings, as exhibiting a less developed mode of phraseology than the expression of the Received Text, is authentic;—most likely the former, which is sustained by the manuscripts C L Δ, as well as by the Coptic *(edd)* and Armenian Versions, and the marginal reading of the Philoxenian Syriac.

–The way-side hearers are those who never allow the word to get under the surface of their thoughts. And hence any little superficial influence which it may exert is easily and speedily removed by any of the winged and watchful agencies of Satan, the Great Adversary of souls. It is well to retain the Hebrew word *Satan*. The evangelist himself retained it, though writing in Greek. It would, however, be unidiomatic, so far as English is concerned, were we to follow him in the use of the article—*the Satan*, (that is, *the Adversary*).

Ver. 16. *And these likewise are they who are sown upon the rocky places*:–*Likewise* or *in like manner*, for the second part of the parable admirably *corresponds* to the first in its susceptibility of application. Note the inartificial nature of the representation. The significates of the parable are, for the moment, shifted,—the hearers of the word being represented *by the seeds sown* instead of *the ground on which they were sown*. But the idea remains unembarrassed for all practical purposes.———*Who, whenever they have heard the word, immediately receive it with gladness*:–The word does get under the surface in their case, and immediately produces some effect. It touches the superficial feelings, and is hastily welcomed. Perhaps, because it is a new thing; perhaps because it is evidently a good thing,—good in particular for objects that terminate on self, good for getting safety and everlasting glory.

Ver. 17. *And have not root in themselves*:–They *have not root*, that is, they are deficient in root. The word of God, though under the surface, does not get far down in its influence. And hence it does not get free scope and fair play. Its influence is speedily arrested by an impenetrable hardness underneath. Religion does not get rooting. There is no receptivity for it in the hidden depths of the being. Almost all that is of it has rushed up to the outside. *They have no root 'in themselves.'* The expression finely suggests that religion must be a personal matter. It is either *something in one's self*, or else nothing at all.———*And so endure but for a time*: A fine free translation; but certainly free. It is literally *but are temporary*. There is in the expression a kind of hasty anticipation of the hasty termination of the hasty religious profession. The measure of the comparative temporariness is to be found in the time that would have been required for the full development of the grain. A full moral spring-time and a full moral summer-time would have been required.———*Afterward, when tribulation or persecution for the word's sake has come to pass*, (γενομένης):–It is assumed that such tribulation or persecution may be expected. The prevailing hatred of "the word," on the part of "the

they are [r]offended. 18 And these are they which [r] 1 Tim. 1. 15.
are sown among thorns; such as hear the word, 19 and the
[s] cares of this world, and the [t] deceitfulness of riches, [s] Phil. 4. 6.
[t] 1 Tim. 6. 9.

world," will, in one way or another, bring it to pass. The words *tribulation* and *persecution* are just two specific modes of representing suffering for the Gospel's sake. The one word—(*tribulation* = θλῖψις)—denotes *pressing* or *oppressing*: the other—(persecution = διωγμός)—denotes *pursuit.*———*Immediately they are offended*: Literally, and as the Rheims has it, *they are scandalized.* The word *scandalized* is just the anglicised form of the Greek word; and the Greek word was provincial. It does not occur in the classics. It is a term, moreover, which it is impossible to translate literally, into Latin or English or French or German or Dutch. It paints a complex picture. The original *scandal*, or *scandalon*, was a part of a trap for catching noxious animals. It was that part on which the animal was expected to strike unawares. When once this *scandal* was struck, the animal was ensnared. A *scandalized* person, therefore, is a person who has unawares struck, or stumbled on, what entraps and ruins him. The persons referred to by our Lord are in this respect *scandalized.* Their religion becomes a thing of stumbling to them, (a σκάνδαλον). They stumble on it, and stagger, and are held fast, or fall. Tyndale's translation is, *they fall immediately*, or, as it is in his 1526 edition, *anon they fall.* It is all over with their profession.

Ver. 18. *And these are they who are sown among the thorns*: Or rather, *And 'others' are they who are sown into the thorns.* The word *others* instead of *these* is the reading of Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford. It is undoubtedly the correct reading,—supported by ℵ B C D L Δ, as well as by the Vulgate and Coptic versions.———*These are they who have heard the word*: The demonstrative *these*, which had erroneously extruded, in the *Received Text*, the word *others* in the preceding clause, comes in here.

Ver. 19. *And the cares of this world*: Or rather, *of this age*, or better still, *of the age.* The *this* is omitted in the manuscripts ℵ B C D L Δ, 1, and in the Vulgate and Armenian versions. Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles leave it out. *The cares of the age* are the *distractions* (μέριμναι) *that are incident to this preliminary period of the world's history,*—a period when things are exceedingly out of order. They are men's *'secular' cares, (ærumnæ seculi).* They come more or less in upon all men; but some men lay themselves peculiarly open to their influence, and allow them to twine and twist themselves, like the serpents of Laocoon, around every energy and susceptibility of their being.———*And the deceitfulness* (or *deceit*) *of riches*: Tyndale has *disseytfulness*, Wycliffe *disseit.* The word for *riches* (πλοῦτος) etymologically means *muchness*, (πολύς). A rich man is a man who has *much;* and who, just because he has *much of what 'answereth'* almost *'all things,'* is exposed to peculiar temptations, which but few can altogether withstand. "If a man suffer the habit of acquisition," says one who was eminently entitled to speak on such a subject, Joshua Wilson, Esq., "to predominate and prevail over him,—as it must predominate "and prevail unless carefully held in check and resolutely counteracted,—he "may become, before he is aware, a miserable victim of 'the pitiful passion

and the [u]lusts of other things entering in, choke the word, and it becometh unfruitful. 20 And these are they which are sown on good ground; such as hear the word, and receive *it*, and bring forth [v]fruit, some thirty-fold, some sixty, and some an hundred.

[u] 1 John 2. 16.

[v] Rom. 7. 4. Col. 1. 10. 2 Pet. 1. 8.

"for accumulation.' Hence the immense importance of early forming and "diligently cultivating the habit of liberality, of beginning to give as soon as "a man begins to get, and increasing the amount of his givings in proportion "to the increase of his gains. One of the greatest deceptions that men are "too apt to practise upon themselves, is to defer being bountiful till their "means have greatly increased. This is indeed a striking proof of what our "Lord calls *the deceitfulness of riches.*" (*Memoir of the Life and Character of Thomas Wilson, Esq.* p. 69.)———*And the lusts of other things*:–Namely, besides money. The expression is literally, *and the lusts concerning the other things.* Note the definitive articles,—'*the*' *lusts (so common in society) concerning* '*the*' *other things (so commonly longed for).* The word *lust* has now for long got narrowed in its reference to sensual desire of a hateful description, as being either improper in kind, or improper in degree. But originally it had a much wider reference, and just meant, generically, *desire, longing, inclination* or *liking.* The Greek term (ἐπιθυμία) is occasionally used in the New Testament when some *good and holy longing* is referred to. See Luke xxii, 15; Phil. i, 23; 1 Thess. ii, 17. But though occasionally thus used, it is nevertheless, in its general New Testament usage, *like a bali loaded on the left side.* It thus reflects the sad fact that somehow or other the affections are the favourite seat of human depravity. The Rheims translation of the clause, copied from the Vulgate, and therefore omitting the articles, is, *and concupiscences about other things.* The Saviour might be referring to "concupiscences" concerning such things as houses, lands, works of art and vertu, posts of honour, gaiety of garments, grandeur of entertainments, and, in general, the myriad appliances of luxury.———*Entering in*:–If a very precise adherence to the parabolic imagery had been aimed at, some such phrase as *growing up* would have been employed instead of *entering in.*———*Choke the word*:–They *crowd in stiflingly upon the word*, (συνπνίγουσιν). Compare Luke viii, 14. They *strangle* it, as Wycliffe has it: his word is *strangulen.*———*And it becometh unfruitful*:–It gets no farther than the leaf of profession, struggling feebly toward the light amid the thicket of thorns. It has not strength to seed. It does nothing for the *propagation* of the word in the world. See on verse 7.

Ver. 20. *And those are they which were sown on the good ground*:–*Those* instead of *these*, is the correct reading, given by Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, (ἐκεῖνοι).———*Such as hear the word, and receive it*:–They receive it *to themselves*, and *for themselves*, (παραδέχονται).———*And bring forth fruit, one thirty, one sixty, and one a hundred*:–Such is the reading of the *Received Text*; and it is retained by Lachmann and Alford, (ἕν). It was the reading that was before our translators. It is the reading too that had been accepted by the authors of the Italic, Vulgate, Coptic, Armenian, and Gothic versions. It is in some respects the easiest reading. (Compare Matt. xiii, 8, 23.) But the word, which with a certain "breathing" is a numeral meaning *one* (ἕν), is,

21 And he said unto them, [w]Is a candle brought [w] Mat. 5. 15.
to be put under a [1]bushel, or under a bed? and not Lu. 8. 16.

Lu. 11. 33. [1] The word in the original signifieth a less measure. See on Mat. v, 15.

---

when pronounced with another "breathing," a preposition meaning *in* (ἐν). It is with this latter breathing that the word is given by Tischendorf and Tregelles, on the authority of the important cursive manuscripts 1, 33, 69, and also of the uncials E F G H K M U V Π (in which uncials the "breathings" are indicated. See Tischendorf). No doubt these cursives and uncials are right, for the phraseology is thus brought into harmony with the representation employed in verse 8. The clause, then, when literally translated runs thus,—*And they bring forth fruit in thirty, and in sixty, and in a hundred*, that is, in the proportional ratios of thirty, sixty, and an hundredfold. These threefold ratios, however, are specified only representatively. All who hear and heartily receive the word are more or less fruitful; but some, according to a peculiar innate energy or peculiarly favourable surroundings, are fruitful to an eminent or even to a pre-eminent degree. All propagate what is good, but some more largely than others.

VER. 21. *And he said to them* :—We know not, and we do not need to know, who are definitely referred to under the pronoun *them*, whether it be the disciples alone, or the people at large. Neither do we know *when* and *where* it was that our Saviour said what he said, whether it was on the day when he delivered *the parable of the sower* to the people, or at the time when he explained it to his disciples, or at some other time. The evangelist's *Memoirs* are remarkably *anecdotical*, but not remarkably *chronological*. The sayings recorded in verses 21—23 were probably some of our Saviour's favourite seed-thoughts. The likelihood is that he would often drop them by the way. Perhaps he would even drop them repeatedly, and need thus to drop them, into the very same soil. The seed-thought contained in this 21st verse, is found in Luke viii, 16; xi, 33; Matt. v, 15.———*Is a candle brought to be set under a bushel, or under a bed? and not to be set on a candlestick?* We have here a remarkable instance of the overlooking, by our Authorized Translators, of the definite article. It occurs four times in the original,—*Is 'the' lamp brought, that it might be set under 'the' measure, or under 'the' couch, not that it might be set on 'the' lamp-stand?* A still more literal translation of the first clause would be, *Does the lamp come?* There is motion observed in the lamp; —but, for the time being, it is left undecided whether it be self-motion or motion by another. Even in the classics (see Kypke and Raphel), as also in our modern idioms, it is common, in many cases, to represent inanimate objects as *coming*, when they are only *brought*. Tyndale's translation is freer still than the Authorized Version,—*Is the candle lighted?—Lamp* is better than *candle*,—for the lamp was the common household night-light among the Jews.—*'The' lamp* :—It is implied that in general only one was used in the family-apartment.—*Under 'the' measure* :—It is implied that there would be one measure in an ordinary domestic establishment, and that it would be generally found in the family-apartment. The word is Roman, (μόδιος = *modius*); so that it is probable that the measure referred to had got into use among the Jews in consequence of their subjection to the Romans. It is not unlikely that it

to be set on a candlestick? 22 [z]For there is nothing hid, which shall not be manifested; neither was [z] Mat. 10. 26. Lu. 12. 2.

1 Cor. 4. 5. Eccl. 12. 14.

would be found to be more exact, and therefore more to be depended on, than the native-made measures. Hence householders might wish to have it beside them, as security against imposition, both in buying and selling. The Roman *modius*, as to capacity, was nearer a *peck* than a *bushel*.—*Under the couch*:–The reference here too bespeaks the influence of Roman customs. Our Saviour must have had in view, not the native *mat, matting,* or *mattress,* which, when simply spread on the floor, served for bed or couch, but the Roman *triclinium*, or raised couch, that was used at formal meals, when the guests reclined at three sides of a central table. This raised couch, covered with some kind of matting, quilting, or carpeting, would be boarded down to the floor, so that a lamp put under it would have its light shut in from view.—*Not that it might be set upon the lamp-stand?*–There is no *and* in the original at the commencement of this clause, and there is no need for making more than one interrogation of the whole saying. *The lamp-stand* was not set upon the table, but stood on the floor, rising aloft.—Our Saviour's fine parabolic seed-thought might have many applications. He wished his disciples, and all people, to make a generous use of all the light, whatever it might be, that had been vouchsafed to them. It was a trust committed to them. No man is illuminated from above for his own sake alone. No man should try to hoard his light, or to consume it in secret. At the same time he need not force it upon the unwilling. The saintly Cæsar Malan of Geneva said, about forty years ago, to the author, then a young student of theology, *Hold up your lamp before men; hold it up fearlessly, and let it shine; but do not dash it into anybody's face!*

Ver. 22. *For*:–In what follows a reason is given for letting the light shine. ———*There is nothing hid, which shall not be manifested*:–A very perplexed clause, as regards some minute details of expression,—in consequence partly of the inherent peculiarity of the original reading, and partly of the varied forms in which the seed-thought occurs in Matt. x, 26; Luke viii, 17; xii, 2. But we doubt not that Tischendorf, following up the labours of Griesbach and Lachmann, has succeeded in presenting the text in its original form,—*There is not anything hidden, unless that it might be manifested,* (οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν τι κρυπτόν, ἐὰν μὴ ἵνα φανερωθῇ). It is one of the longest plummets of thought that our Saviour ever let out in conversation. God hides some things. It is his glory to hide them, (Prov. xxv, 2). He hid several very important things under the shadows of the Jewish dispensation. He has hidden millions of other things;—in the crust of the earth, for instance, perhaps in its flora, perhaps in its fauna, perhaps in invisible telluric influences. He has hidden innumerable things in the sun and moon and stars. Christ himself hid many things under the parables which he spake, (verses 11, 12). He hid in his own heart many other things which even his nearest disciples could not have "stood" (John xvi, 12) or "understood," (John xiii, 7). But this hiding, on the part of Christ and of God is, in every case, not final but provisional. *The truth is hidden, that it may be found out and manifested.* And *no one thing is*

any thing kept secret, but that it should come abroad.
23 [y]If any man have ears to hear, let him hear.
24 And he said unto them, [z]Take heed what ye hear. [a]With what measure ye mete, it shall be

[y] Ver. 9.
[z] Lu. 8. 18.
[a] Mat. 7. 2. Lu. 6. 38.

*hidden, unless that it may be by and by manifested.* Nothing is to be hidden for ever. There is always a final end in hiding: and the end is *that it may be manifested.* Hence human progression in science and in all the applications of science. Even when men try to hide things, it is divinely permitted for a season, only that, after a season, all may be revealed. The whole universe by and by, with all its contents, will be, as it were, absolutely transparent to every illumined eye. To the eye of God there is already, everywhere, complete transparency.——*Neither was any thing kept secret,*—or rather *made secret,—but that it should come abroad*:–Or, as Alford gives it, *but that it should come to light*, or, as Sharpe gives it, *but that it should come into sight*, (*εἰς φανερόν*). It is an emphatic repetition of the idea of the preceding clause,—but simply bringing into view the intentional *making of a thing secret.* Whoever has the intention,—it either is, or is divinely permitted to be, just that in due time the wrapping may be taken away, and the thing exposed to universal view.

VER. 23. *If any one has ears to hear, let him hear*:–It is better to say *has* (*ἔχει*) than *have*, for the idea subsumed is that *every one actually has ears to hear.* Let every one hear then. Let him voluntarily listen till he understand. It was one of the Saviour's fine didactic seed-thoughts, which he seems to have very frequently dropped by the way, (ver. 9). It needs still to be dropped, and dropped time after time into the same ears. There are, comparatively speaking, but few patient and impartial hearers, but few patient and impartial thinkers, in the world.

VER. 24, 25. Another little cluster of anecdotical sayings.

VER. 24. *And he said to them*:–To whom? We know not, and do not need to know. The value of the apophthegms does not depend on the incidents of their utterance. They are of universal application.——*Take heed 'what' ye hear*:–It is a slightly different idea from that which is brought out in Luke viii, 18, *Take heed 'how' ye hear.* Both injunctions are needed; and indeed they wonderfully intertwine, so that he who takes heed *how he hears* will likely be careful as to *what he hears*, and *vice versa*. There is no scope, it is true, for the exercise of will in reference to many of the things which we hear. And hence every man often hears things which it would be better for him, in his present circumstances, not to hear. But there are, on the other hand, many other things, which we may either hear or not, as we choose. We are responsible, therefore, for much that we hear, as well as for all that we speak. And if, for instance, we be eager to hear words of detraction, or censorious tittle-tattle, and scandal-talk, in reference to our neighbours, we must take the retributive consequences. Most likely there will be "counterpart" retribution. See next clause.——*With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you*:–Literally '*in*' *what measure.* The reference is to *a measure of capacity.* The same measure, "in" which we mete out our treatment of others, will be retributively employed, for measuring out to ourselves the treatment which

measured to you: and unto you that hear shall more be
given. 25 For [b] he that hath, to him shall be [b] Mat. 13. 12.
Mat. 25. 29. Lu. 8. 18. Lu. 19. 26.

---

we shall receive. Compare Matt. vii, 2; Luke vi, 38. It is a law of retribution in morals, somewhat analogous to the law of reaction in physics. It will, sooner or later, except in certain peculiar cases modified by repentance, be fulfilled in the experience of all. It will be fulfilled either in kind or in equivalent; either imminently or ultimately; either from without or from within; and if from without, either from around (from men) or from above (from God). *As we treat, so shall we be treated. What we sow, that we shall reap.*———*And unto you that hear shall more be given*:—A clause that has been tampered with, and badly tinkered, by unperspicacious critics. It was supposed that there is a close connection between the injunction *Take heed what ye hear*, and the words of the preceding verse, *If any man have ears to hear, let him hear.* It was hence supposed that in the words *what ye hear* there is a reference only to what is good,—a reference to Christ's own explication of the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven. And then it was supposed that when he adds, *in what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you*, he means, *in what measure ye mete out your hearing and attention, in that same measure shall the subject-matter of hearing and attention be meted out to you.* And then and thence it was inferred that our Saviour meant to add, *and unto you that hear*—or, as the Gothic version gives it, *unto you that believe—shall more be given.* That is, *the more you hear of divine truth, the more shall you get to hear.* The idea is admirable in itself, but it is foisted in upon the phraseology of the evangelist. The injunction *Take heed what you hear* implies the duty of discrimination in reference to the objects on which hearing may terminate. And in what follows there is a warning against hearing what should not be heard. *If we hear concerning others what we should not hear, others will in all likelihood hear concerning us what we would not like them to hear.* There will be retribution. In the clause that is added the idea is,—*There will be more than merely equal retribution: there will be retribution with a surplus.* We shall be *paid back with interest.* Griesbach suspected that this superadded clause was altogether spurious,—a "gloss." Hence he omits it entirely from the text. It is omitted in the Cambridge manuscript (D). But this is going too far. There is no doubt, however, that the words *that hear* (τοῖς ἀκούουσιν) were originally a marginal gloss added by some one, who, forgetting or not knowing the anecdotical character of the passage, misapprehended the meaning of the divine counsel. They are wanting in ℵBCLΔ, and in the Italic, Vulgate, Coptic, Armenian, and Æthiopic versions. They are omitted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford. The clause, as it originally stood, was simply, *and it shall be added to you*, or as the Rheims has it, *and more shall be given unto you.*

Ver. 25. *For he who hath, to him shall be given*:—A principle of very wide applicability. Whosoever has something good, having acquired it by the right use of his powers, to him shall more be given. If, for instance, by not hearing what should not be heard, time and opportunity are left for hearing what should be heard, and if consequently something is learned which it is a

given: and he that hath not, from him shall be taken even that which he hath.

26 And he said, So is the kingdom of God, as if a man should cast seed into the ground; 27 and should sleep, and

---

privilege to learn, then the learning-faculty is enlarged, and more and still more will be progressively acquired.———*And he who hath not, even what he hath shall be taken from him*:–The other side of the principle, though put, so far as the grammatical phraseology is concerned, in an exceedingly inartificial manner. Whosoever *has not the good which he ought to have acquired*, and has it not in consequence of the misapplication of *the good power of acquisition which he has*, will suffer loss in his good power. The power is abused, and will be weakened. If the weakening goes on, the power will by and by become a wreck.

VER. 26. *And he said*:–The time and connection are not absolutely certain. But it is probable that the reference is to the time when our Saviour delivered to the people *the Parable of the Sower*.———*So is the kingdom of God*:–This is the beginning of a little parable that is preserved by Mark alone. Strauss, indeed, (*Leben*, ii, vi, §. 74), threw out the suggestion that it might be but "another recension" of *the parable of the tares* or *darnel* (Matt. xiii, 24–30), but without the reference to the darnel,—somewhat, apparently, on the principle of *the Play of Hamlet with the part of Hamlet left out!* Hilgenfeld (*Evang.* p. 133) takes the same view; and, sad to say, Ewald (*Evang.* p. 234). Michelsen, too,—only he holds that the form of the parable in Mark is the original form, out of which the fuller form in Matthew was ultimately elaborated. (*Het Evan.* p. 56.) Wantonly all through. Such conceptions can only be reached by an indiscriminate application of a thumbscrew-species of exposition. Scholten admits the originality and self-contained distinctness of the parable, (*Het Oudste Ev.* p. 197).—*So is the kingdom of God*, viz. in a certain aspect of its multiform spiritual phenomena. The particle *So* looks forward to the similitude that is about to be expressed.———*As if a man should have cast the seed upon the earth* (βάλῃ τὸν σπέρον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς): We are not to suppose, with Theophylact, and many other expositors, that the *man*, here parabolically pictured forth, is the Saviour himself. The ignorance that is ascribed to him at the end of the 27th verse,—not to speak of other items of the representation,—lays an interdict on this idea. It is evidently the ordinary preacher of the Gospel who is referred to. The *seed* represents the *word* of God, or the *word* of the kingdom of God, that is, the *word* of the truth of the Gospel. Note the article, '*the*' *seed*, that is, *the particular seed* which the man had got to sow. He sowed it *upon* the prepared soil; and he would finish up the process by using what simple means were available to him, to get the grain duly bedded and protected.

VER. 27. *And should sleep and rise night and day*:–Note the present tenses of the verbs *sleep* and *rise* after the past in the preceding verse, *have cast*. When once the casting of the seed upon the ground is *past*, the husbandman *goes to rest*, and thenceforward continues, day by day, to prosecute his varied avocations. In the alternations of *sleeping* and *rising* a precedence is given, in the parable, to the former, because the speaker's mind begins to consider

rise night and day, and the seed should spring and grow up, he knoweth not how. 28 For the [c]earth [c] Gen. 1. 11, 12

---

the alternating series from the point of time when the seed was sown. On the night following that day the husbandman *sleeps*. In the morning he wakes and *rises*. And thenceforward the same alternations are repeated for an undefined length of time. In our Authorized Version there is a comma strangely inserted after *and should sleep*, and then another comma after *and rise night and day*. It is almost as if the translators had thought, with Theophylact, that the husbandman is represented as anxiously rising both by night and by day to see that all was going on well; or, as if they had been influenced by Erasmus, who, in the 4th edition of his New Testament, proposed to arrest the parabolic reference to the husbandman at the conclusion of the words *and should sleep*, ascribing the succeeding words *and rise day and night* to the *seed*. Purvey, in his revision of Wycliffe's version, gives the same interpretation, *and he slepte, and it rise up nighte and dai*. It is an impossible construction, as is evident from the fact that reference to the seed is expressly introduced in the following clause. *The husbandman sleeps and rises night and day*. It is an inartificial expression. The word *night* is to be connected with *sleeps;* the word *day* with *rises*. The husbandman is not blamed for his *sleeping*, no more than for his *rising*. He needs both to *sleep*, and, when he wakes, to *rise*. And if he has done his daily duty, as he is presumed to have done, he may lay himself down to sleep and rise again without any carking care.———*And the seed should sprout and grow up*:-Literally, *and should lengthen*. The living thing in the seed, which constitutes its vital germ or inner essence, does sprout and lengthen into the stalk and its culminating spike. It will be noticed that the clauses of the parable are artlessly aggregated; but yet quite clearly.———*He knows not how*:-Or, according to the collocation in the original, *how he know not*. Very literally it is, *as he knows not*, that is, *in such a way as he knows not*. Erasmus would strangely and most unwarrantably interpret thus, *in such a way as it (the seed) knows not*. The seed sprouts and shoots up in a way unknown to the husbandman. The Saviour does not say that no husbandman, or philosopher, or investigator, will ever know how a seed sprouts and shoots up. He is simply supposing a case, which would in his day be common enough, and which is common still, —the case of a man casting seed into the ground, and then sleeping and rising for days in succession without ever touching again the seed which he sowed. Not only does the man not touch the seed, or seek by his own skill and energy to operate *in* it, he does not even know its inner essence, or the nature of its inner energy. It sprouts and shoots up in a way he knows not. The Saviour's meaning is,—that, *in the case supposed*, the man knows not how the seed germinates and grows up to maturity.

Ver. 28. *For*:-This ratiocinative particle is dropped out of the text by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford. It is not found in the very important manuscripts ℵ A B C L; and it is omitted in the Coptic version, (both Wilkins's and Schwartze's editions), and in the Philoxenian Syriac, and the Æthiopic. It is evidently not needed.———*The earth bringeth forth fruit of itself*:-Or, still more literally, *of itself the earth beareth fruit*. The

bringeth forth fruit of herself; first the blade, then the ear,

adjective, that is very imperfectly rendered *of itself*, means *self-moving* or *self-acting*, (αὐτομάτη). The earth is represented as *automatic*. There is a kind of *unconscious spontaneity* in it. There is indeed no real spontaneity attributable to the earth. Real spontaneity is a property of consciousness and mind; and the earth is impersonal. But there is a Spontaneity, altogether distinct from the consciousness and mind of men, pervading the earth. And hence, relatively to man, the earth is automatic. It is not, relatively to God, an automaton. It "has its being, and moves, in God." In all its motions, He is moving. But it is the aim of the Saviour in the expression before us, to represent, not what the earth is in its relation to God, but what it is in its relation to man. Multitudinous motions go on in the earth in absolute independence of man's volitions and efforts. In this respect *the earth beareth fruit 'automatously.'* The word was a favourite with the classical writers. They frequently speak of automatous or spontaneous plants or fruits,—meaning such as grow without the help of man. Herodotus represents the Nile as irrigating the fields of Egypt *automatously* (ii, 14). The hand of man is not needed to spread out the water. In like manner the hand of man is not needed to push up the sprouting of the grains of corn, or to give shaping to the stalks or to the ears.———*First the blade*: Out of the compound verb which is rendered, in the preceding clause, *bringeth forth fruit*, or *beareth fruit* (καρποφορεῖ), we must mentally detach the element that simply means *bringeth forth* or *beareth*, and carry it forward to this and the succeeding clause. *The earth bringeth forth, first, the blade.* The word *blade* denotes *the grassy part* of the plant, or simply *the grass*, as Purvey here renders it in his Revision of Wycliffe. It is the word that is commonly used to denote *grass*. (See Matt. vi, 30; xiv, 19; Mark vi, 39; John vi, 10; 1 Cor. iii, 12; 1 Pet. i, 24; Rev. viii, 7.) It here denotes *the leaf-equipped stalk* of the corn-plant.———*Then the ear*: Or *spike*. See Luke vi, 1.———*Then the full corn in the ear*: The reading of Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles is, *then (there comes) the full corn in the ear*. *The full corn*, or *the full grain*, or *the full wheat*. The word is generally rendered *wheat*, which was the grain in common use for human food. See Matt. iii, 12; xiii, 25, 29, 30; Luke xvi, 7; xxii, 31; John xii, 24; Acts xxvii, 38; 1 Cor. xv, 37; Rev. vi, 6. The *'full' grain* means the *'filled up' grain*. The grain is at first small, flaccid, pulpy. But by and by, under ordinarily propitious circumstances, it swells out to its full size, and then gets compact and hard. *And all this without any manipulation on the part of man.* It is not meant, indeed, that man is utterly unable to do anything either to help or to hinder the growth. Man can do much. It is evident that he can do much *in the way of hindering*. He might trample the growing stalks or let them be choked by weeds and thorns. He can also do not a little *to help*; and hence the vast advances that may be made, and that have been made, in the science of agriculture. He can carefully prepare the soil. He can drain his field, when that would be beneficial. He can manure it properly. He can pluck up certain weeds and noxious shrubs. He can here and there let in additional sunlight by removing overshadowing trees. He can see to his fences, so that the grain may not be trampled and injured by the foot of man or of beast.

after that the full corn in the ear. 29 But when the fruit

---

He can scare away the birds that flock around; and he can entrap such other animals as might wish to prey on his crop. The husbandman has much that he can do to help forward the crop. *But still there are limits to his power.* When the Saviour speaks of the man casting the seed on the ground, and then sleeping and rising for a series of days and weeks, he does not intend, by specifying *the casting of the seed*, to exclude all other operations. *On the contrary, the operation of 'casting the seed' is mentioned by him, as representative of a certain limited number of agricultural operations.* And the idea that he would impress is this, that there is a limit beyond which the agriculturist cannot go, and at which consequently he must abandon all efforts of his own, and trust to a greater power. He cannot go to each grain, and elaborate it into the stalk and the spike and the fulness of the spike. *In like manner, there is a limit to ministerial labour in reference to the growth of true religion in the soul.* Ministers of the Gospel may do much, either to help or to hinder the growth of true religion, in the souls of those to whom they minister. They may mismanage the preparation of the soil. They may neglect the fences of the field. They may fail to watch as they ought to watch. Or on the other hand they may use all diligence to plough, and harrow, and pluck up briers and thorns and weeds, and to ward off the birds and beasts of prey. But they soon reach the limits of their power. Man, as Theophylact here says, is a free-agent. He continues to be free while he is being operated on by his fellow-men. His heart is automatous. And then too, a Higher Spontaneity than his own is at work within him, and is needed to be at work. "My Father worketh hitherto," says Jesus, "and I work." (John v, 17.) It is God who "gives the increase." (1 Cor. iii, 7.) The word of the truth of the Gospel is a wonderful kind of grain. There is *life* in it. (1 Pet. i, 23.) There is automatism (*αὐτοματισμός*) in it, as well as in the heart in which it is sown. There is *automatic thought* in the *word*. And automatic thought—every real thought—is just a germ in a living mind. The thought that is in the word of the truth of the Gospel is *the thought of the Holy Spirit of God*. The moment that we get beyond the mere husk or symbolism of the "word," the moment that we get into the "thought," we are in the spontaneities of the Divine Mind. Hence the power of the Holy Spirit. It is no mere mechanical operation. Hence the power of the word of the truth of the Gospel. It is the power of the living mind and heart of the Living God.

Ver. 29. *But when the fruit is brought forth*:—An exceedingly free translation of an exceeding difficult expression. It was Tyndale's. It must have been originally given, and subsequently reproduced, under a kind of critical despair. The same despair seems to have seized upon the old Syriac translator, who renders the expression, *when the fruit has been fattened*, (that is, no doubt, *when it has been matured*). The Philoxenian has it correspondingly and as freely, *when the fruit has been filled*. The Arabic, Æthiopic, and Persic translations are equally free. So is the Gothic, *when the fruit is given out (atgibada)*. The translation in the margin of our Authorized Version is similarly free, *when the fruit is ripe*,—a rendering adopted into their texts by

is [2]brought forth, immediately he [d]putteth in the sickle, because the [e]harvest is come.

[2] Or, *ripe.*

[d] Rev. 14. 15.

[e] Psa. 126. 6. Mat. 9. 37. John 4. 35.

Mace and Wakefield. Rodolphus Dickinson has *when the grain is matured.* The verb, however, is active, not passive, (παραδοῖ or παραδῷ). It means literally *has delivered up.* Klostermann supposes that it must have been a technical agricultural phrase, denoting the ripened condition of the grains. The majority of critics, inclusive of Henry Stephens, Beza, Felbinger, Wolf, Bengel, Fritzsche, suppose that it must be used reflexively, or intransitively, *whenever the fruit has delivered 'itself'*—or *shall have delivered 'itself'—up.* The verb is used in this reflexive or intransitive acceptation in the Alexandrine text of the Septuagint version of Joshua xi, 19—*and there was no city which did not 'surrender'* (ὅτις οὐ παρέδωκεν) *to the children of Israel.* If our word *surrender* had not got conventionally narrowed in its range of application, it might have been a suitable translation here. Meyer, Lange, Bisping, Grimm, and not a few others, suppose that the verb has here its occasional meaning of *permit* (a mode of *delivering up*),—*when the fruit shall have permitted.* This meaning is found again and again in Herodotus (v, 67; vi, 103; vii, 18; ix, 78), and other classics. But it is unbiblical, and yields a rather awkward and constrained sense, when applied, not to persons as in Herodotus, nor to *circumstances* as in our corresponding modern idiom, but to *fruit.* We wait for fuller light. But meantime we would either accept the reflexive import of the verb, or suppose that the language abruptly and inartificially leaves the reader to supply, out of his own consideration of the case in hand, *what it is that is delivered up by the fruit.* In the parable, as a whole, we have *successive working* exhibited. The *working* passes along, in trust as it were, now *through* man, now *from* man, now *to* man. We have, first, the *working* of the sower. He casts the seed into the soil. Then the working passes from him; and the seed itself automatously works. It sprouts and grows up. The soil too works with synchronous automatism. It "brings forth the blade and the ear and the full corn in the ear." There is similar synchronous working, unspecified in the parable but implied, on the part of the rain from heaven and the sun. By and by the working of the soil and its cosmical accompaniments is finished. So is the working of the plant itself, and of the maturing fruit. But still the full complement of working is not finished. Something remains to be done; and the fruit, when by its own automatous operation it has become fully matured, *'delivers up'* (the working power which had been divinely committed to it, or transmitted through it). The working must now be *taken up again* by man. See next clause.——*Immediately he putteth in the sickle*:—*He*, that is, the *man* (verse 26), the *husbandman.*—He *'putteth in'*:—literally, *he sendeth out,*—'apostolically,' as it were, (ἀποστέλλει). He *sendeth out the sickle* in the hands of the reaper. The "lord of the harvest" is supposed to hire reapers, and to "send them forth into his harvest."——*Because the harvest is come*:—The time for gathering in and enjoying the fruits is come.—The time, thus parabolically referred to, is assumed by Theophylact, Dr. Samuel Clarke, Meyer, and many others, to be the consummation of all things. But this assumption is based on the prior

30 And he said, Whereunto shall we liken the kingdom of God? or with what comparison shall we compare it? 31 *It is* like a [f]grain of mustard seed, which, when it is sown in the earth, is less than all the seeds that be

[f] Mat. 13. 31. Lu. 13. 18.

---

assumption that it is the Saviour himself who is represented by the husbandman. It is, however, as we have seen, not the divine, but the human workman, who is meant by the *man*. The parable teaches the limitations, not of *divine*, but of *ministerial agency*, in the moral effects of the Gospel. It is very limited. But if it be faithfully exerted at the time when it is really required, there will, in due season, be the enjoyment of a "harvest-home" of blessed results. We do not need to assume, with Archbishop Trench, that the reaping of the grain refers to the gathering of believers, "when they are ripe for glory," "into everlasting habitations." (*The Parables*, p. 283.) "Certainly," says Dr. Adam Clarke, "the parable does not say so." What is to hinder us from supposing that the reaping meant corresponds to that which is spoken of in John iv, 35, 36, "Lift up your eyes, and look on the fields; for they are white already to harvest. *And he that reapeth receiveth wages, and gathereth fruit into life eternal.*" Compare Ps. cxxvi, 6; Matt. ix, 37, 38. "The reapers," says Arnot, "are the "human ministers of the word, and the reaping is the successful ingathering "in conversion here, not the admission of the redeemed into glory at the end "of the world." (*The Parables*, p. 316.)

VER. 30. *And he said*:—Here follows another of the Saviour's parables. ——*Whereunto might we liken* (ὁμοιώσωμεν) *the kingdom of God?*—The Saviour, sympathetically and with fine oratorical tact, stimulates his hearers to thoughtfulness by associating them with himself in his search for appropriate similitudes. Hence the *we*. Instead of *whereunto* (τίνι) Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford have the corresponding word *how* (πῶς). It is the reading of ℵ B C L Δ. ——*Or with what comparison shall we compare it?*—The expression, more literally, and according to the correct reading (ἢ ἐν τίνι αὐτὴν παραβολῇ ϑῶμεν) runs thus, *or in what parable shall we place it?* Such is the reading of ℵ B C* L Δ, 63. The Saviour continues to speak as if he were searching about for a parable, that would serve as an appropriate setting for the truth, which he wished to enforce in reference to a certain phase of the Kingdom of God.

VER. 31. *As to a grain of mustard seed* (ὡς κόκκῳ σινάπεως):—This is the inartificially constructed answer to the twofold question proposed. The initial *as* may be unfolded thus, *we might liken it*,—namely *to a grain of mustard seed*.——*Which when it is sown in the earth*, or *which whenever it shall have been sown on the earth*:—Our Saviour pictures a case that may be easily conceived to occur at any time, (and which in fact, as we otherwise know, does very frequently occur).——*Is less than all the seeds that be in the earth*:—Or literally,—according to the inartificial text exhibited by Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, (μικρότερον ὂν πάντων κ.τ.λ.),—*being a less (thing), or a less (seed), than all the seeds upon the earth*. The language is broken, but the sense is obvious. The mustard seed is an exceedingly small seed,—not indeed absolutely smaller than all other seeds known to modern botanists, but smaller than all the seeds that the Jews were accustomed to sow in their fields and their gardens.

in the earth: 32 but when it is sown, it groweth up, and becometh [g]greater than all herbs, and shooteth out great branches; so that the fowls of the air may lodge under the shadow of it.

[g] Isai. 2. 2. Dan. 2. 44.

33 And with many such parables spake he the word unto them, [h]as they were able to hear *it*. 34 But with-

[h] John 16. 12.

---

Ver. 32. *And when it is sown*:—Or, as before, *And whenever it shall have been sown*. It is an artless repetition, but with a peculiar emphasis. It breaks the participial construction that was in progress at the conclusion of the preceding verse, and brings back the attention to the time, whensoever that might be, when the seed may have been committed to the soil.———*It groweth up*:—Or, as the Rheims has it, *it riseth up. It ascends.*———*And becometh greater than all herbs*: Or, more literally, *than all the herbs*, namely that people in Palestine were accustomed to rear in their gardens. The word rendered *herbs* (λάχανα) denotes a peculiar species of herbs, viz. *pot-herbs* or *garden-herbs.*———*And shooteth out great branches*: Literally, *maketh great branches*,—great, relatively to the branches of other garden-herbs. J. C. Ryle says, "The enormous size to which the rhododendron, the heath, and the fern will grow, in some climates which suit them better than ours, should be remembered by an English reader of this parable." (*Expository Thoughts on Mark*, p. 79.)——*So that the birds of the heaven are able to lodge under its shade*: *To lodge*, or, *to rest*, as the word is rendered in Acts ii, 26. Wycliffe has *to dwell*, and so Purvey, Tyndale, Coverdale, and the Rheims. The Geneva has *to build*: and in Cranmer's Bible it is *to make their nestes*. The original term properly means *to pitch their tents*, (κατασκηνόω). Here it would appear to mean *to roost*.——The parable seems intended to teach the vast resources of extension that were summed up in the minute germ of the kingdom of heaven. The Community, in the day of our Saviour's humiliation, was, indeed, exceedingly small. But it was destined to have a great and glorious development, transcending that of all the other kingdoms and communities of the world. The same principle is exemplified, in miniature, in the experience of every individual subject of the Kingdom. The heavenly principle within is small at the outset, but it gradually expands and grows and ramifies into the whole amplitude of the heart and intellect and life.

Ver. 33. *And with many such parables*: *Such* as are recorded in what goes before, *such* in form, and *such* in doctrinal aim. The evangelist has only preserved a selection of specimens.———*Spake he the word to them*:—That circle of truth or truths whose centre is "the Gospel."———*As they were able to hear*:—Or, as the same idea is represented in John xvi, 12, *as they were able to bear* or *carry*. The idea is not that our Saviour spoke to them as many parables as they were able to penetrate and understand. The people in all likelihood did not penetrate and understand any one of them (see verses 11, 12). But they were profoundly interested in them nevertheless. Their spirit was charmed. There are limits, however, to the power of attention, and the susceptibility of interest. When the vessel becomes full and is running over, it is needless to pour in more.

Ver. 34. *But without a parable spake he not unto them*:—Although he spoke

out a parable spake he not unto them. And when they were alone, he expounded all things to his disciples.

35 And the same day, when the even was come, he saith unto them, Let us pass over unto the other side. 36 And when they had sent away the multitude, they took him even as he was in the ship. And there were also with him

---

much,—as much as they could hear when straining their attention to its utmost limit of tension,—yet he did not deviate from the parabolic form of instruction. The auditory that was before him was not in a condition to endure the undisguised truth.———*But he expounded all things privately to his disciples*: *Explicated* is the corresponding word in the Rheims version. The cognate noun is rendered *interpretation* in 2 Pet. i, 20. Instead of *to his disciples*, the manuscripts ℵ B C L Δ read *to his own disciples* (ἰδίοις), and Tischendorf has introduced this reading into his text.

VER. 35. *And he saith to them the same day when the evening was come, Let us cross over to the other side* :–Namely, of the sea of Galilee. He refers to its eastern side, where, in consequence of the comparatively barren and rocky character of much of the coast and of the adjacent country, there was not nearly so dense a population as on the western side. "There is no recess," says Dean Stanley, "in the eastern hills; no towns along its banks corresponding to those "in the plain of Gennesareth. Thus this wilder region became a natural refuge "from the active life of the western shores." (*Sinai and Palestine*, p. 379.) As to the chronology of the occurrence that is about to be related, Mark seems to be precise. (See on Matt. viii, 23.)

VER. 36. *And when they had dismissed the crowd* :–No doubt, by telling them firmly that the Master would give no more instructions on that occasion.——— *They take him (with them) as he was in the boat* :–Just as he was in that particular boat in which he had been sitting while addressing the people. (Ver. 1.) They did not, on the one hand, go in quest of a more convenient or comfortable boat; neither did they, on the other, go ashore to get any special baggage or provisions. Time was pressing; and there might have been only additional pressure from the lingering remnants of the crowd, if the boat had been brought to land.———*And there was also with him other little boats* :–The word *little* should be cancelled. It is a diminutive term indeed (πλοιάρια), which was in the text that was lying before our Authorized Translators; but in the best manuscripts (such as ℵ A B C D Γ M Δ Π, 1, 33, 69), the term employed is the same that is used to describe the vessel which carried our Lord (πλοῖα). Griesbach, Lachmann, Tregelles, and Tischendorf in his 8th edition, have cancelled the diminutive term. It would appear that while our Lord was engaged in teaching the people, who stood crowding far and wide on the shore, there had been individuals, who availed themselves of the opportunity of the adjoining boats for getting nearer his person, and into a more favourable position for listening to his discourse. Hence a little fleet had gathered round the boat in which our Saviour sat. Doubtless at that period of comparative national prosperity there would be many boats available. Josephus describes (*in the 3d Book of his Wars, ch. x*) a naval engagement that took place on the lake, when both the natives on the one hand, and the Romans under Titus

other little ships. 37 [i] And there arose a great storm of wind, and the waves beat into the ship, so that it was now full. 38 And he was in the hinder part of the ship, asleep on a pillow: and they awake him, and say

[i] Mat. 8. 24. Lu. 8. 23.

---

on the other, had *many vessels*. The "other boats" which had gathered round our Saviour's boat are said to have been *with 'him,'*—for 'he' as distinguished from the boat which bore him, and the 'apostolic' crew who manned it, was the great object of interest. It is, we presume, in an artlessly incidental manner that mention is here made of these "other boats." It is probable that their occupants would, like the people on the shore, be assured by the disciples that the Master had concluded for that occasion, and that he now desired seclusion and rest.

VER. 37. *And*—by and by as they were rowing across—*there arose a great storm of wind*:—*A hurricane of wind*, such as the sea of Galilee is notoriously exposed to. Mr. Macgregor speaks of "a headlong flood of wind like a waterfall," which he witnessed pouring down into the lake. He says,—"The peculiar effects of squalls among mountains are well known to all who "have boated much on lakes; but on the sea of Galilee the wind has a "singular force and suddenness; and this is, no doubt, because that sea is so "deep in the world that the sun rarifies the air in it enormously, and the "wind, speeding swift above a long and level plateau, gathers much force "as it sweeps through flat deserts, until suddenly it meets this huge gap "in the way, *and it tumbles down here irresistible.*" (*The Rob Roy on the Jordan*, p. 421.) On two distinct occasions Mr. Macgregor encountered this "great storm of wind." With reference to the first of the two he says,—"A brisk breeze from Bashan had freshened while we paddled along these "bays, and the short 'choppy' waves at Jordan's mouth were angry enough "to require attention while crossing them. I ascended Jordan to wait for "the wind's pleasure if it might calm down; but instead of that, the sea rose "more and more, and at last heavy clouds in the east burst into a regular gale." —"The wind whistled, and sea-gulls screamed as they were borne on the "scud. Thick and ragged clouds drifted fast over the water, which became "almost green in colour, as if it were on the salt sea, and the illusion was "heightened by the complete obscurity of the distance, for the other side of "the lake was quite invisible."—"The waves burst in upon the oleanders, and "broke high and noisy upon the rugged rocks."—"The storm lasted next day." (*The Rob Roy*, pp. 336, 339.)———*And the waves lashed into the boat, so that the boat was now full*:- Or rather, *was already filling*, notwithstanding, no doubt, the utmost efforts of the crew at "baling." Luther and Coverdale regard the word *lashed* as transitive, and construe the word *waves* as supplying the objective to the action of the verb. Coverdale's version is, *There arose a great storme of wynde, and daszhed the wawes in to the shippe.* The construction of our Authorized Translators, however, is evidently correct.

VER. 38. *And he was in the hinder-part-of-the-ship*:—*In the poop*, or, as Tyndale has it, *the stern*, (ἐν τῇ πρύμνῃ), where there would be some little cabin. (ἐν instead of ἐπί is the reading of ℵ A B C D L Δ.)———*Asleep on a pillow*:- Literally, *sleeping on 'the' pillow*, that is, *sleeping with his head reposing on*

unto him, Master, carest thou not that we perish? 39 And he arose, and rebuked the wind, and said unto the sea, Peace, be still. *j* And the wind ceased, and there was a great calm. 40 And he said unto them, Why are ye so fearful? How is it that ye have no faith?

*j* Psa. 33. 9. Psa. 89. 9.

---

*'the' pillow,*—the one pillow which belonged, as part of the boat's furniture, to the small cabin at the stern. There was thus convenience in the boat for siesta and nocturnal sleep when required. How touching that our Saviour should have been so speedily asleep! How suggestive, too, of his great exhaustion, that he should have been so sound asleep! Those delicate energies of his humanity, that needed to be statedly replenished, had been subjected to an excessive drain, in consequence of the urgent demands of the people for teaching and healing. See chap. iii, 20; and compare vi, 31.———*And they awake him*:–Literally, *they arouse him.*———*And say unto him, Master, is it no concern to thee that we perish?*–They were evidently much alarmed; but their alarm, however great, was no excuse for such a peevish, and peevishly inculpating, expostulation. The word which our translators render *Master*, properly means *Teacher* or *Rabbi*, (διδάσκαλε).

VER. 39. *And when he was roused up* (διεγερθείς), *he rebuked the wind*:–*Rebuked*, though perhaps as good a term as can be got, is an exceedingly imperfect translation, (ἐπετίμησεν). The term is sometimes rendered *charged* or *straitly charged*. (See Matt. xii, 16; Mark iii, 12; viii, 30; Luke ix, 21.) It primarily means *rated*. Wycliffe renders it here *manasside*, i.e. *menaced*. It means that our Lord laid, as it were, his commands on the wind, peremptorily and authoritatively, and as if it had been transgressing bounds. Such was the outer form with which, for gracious exoteric purposes, he clothed the forthgoing of his inner volition. And what, too, if it should have been the case that he saw that there was some malignant Personality astir in the midst of the storm?———*And said to the sea, Peace, Be still*:–Very literally, *Be silent! Be muzzled!* The personification adapted itself to the *roar* of the storm. ———*And the wind ceased*:–It *fell* as if it had been utterly *exhausted by the exertion of its own beating*, (ἐκόπασεν).———*And there was—there came on* (ἐγένετο)—*a great calm*:–*Greet pesiblenesse*, as Wycliffe has it, that is, *great peacefulness*. The lake would then be, as it appeared to the eye of Dr. Tristram, when he got his first glimpse of its beauty, a "calm blue basin, slumbering in placid sweetness beneath its surrounding wall of hills." (*The Land of Israel*, p. 426.)

VER. 40. *And he said to them, Why are ye so fearful?–So*, that is, '*thus*,' '*on this fashion*,' '*after this manner*.' The adverb is rendered in these different ways in Matt. xxvi, 54; Mark ii, 12; John xxi, 1; Matt. vi, 9; &c. The expression draws attention to the degree and manner of their frightenedness. ———*How have ye not faith?*–It was wonderful that, with the Lord in the vessel, they should have allowed themselves to be so entirely flurried and unmanned. Had they not already witnessed enough to assure them that He held, at his girdle, the keys of the kingdom of nature? Had they not noticed that he had some secret access to all the Resources of the universe? Must not all seas be his highways? Must not all winds be his messengers?

41 And they [k]feared exceedingly, and said one to another, What manner of man is this, that even the wind and the sea [l]obey him?

[k] Jonah 1. 16.
[l] Job 38. 11.

## CHAPTER V.

*Jesus, when he arrives at the eastern side of the sea of Galilee, in the country of the Gerasenes, delivers a miserable and fierce demoniac,* 1—20. *On returning to the western side*

---

VER. 41. *And they feared exceedingly*:—Literally, *they feared a great fear.* They had already been conscious of far too great fear in the presence of the sudden hurricane. But their fear was now greater still, though calm and more noble, in the presence of Him who had willed the hurricane into repose. They were filled with *awe.* They felt that they were in the presence of a far greater Power than what had pressed upon their senses in the storm. They seem to have got a glimpse into the interior of something that stretched away into infinity.———*And said to one another, What manner of man is this?*—Or, more literally, *Who then is this?* The *then* has a touch of argumentativeness in its import,—*since it is the case that he can do such wonders.* They were but beginning to see. There were heights and depths in the Saviour which they had not hitherto realized.———*That both the wind and the sea are obedient to him!* The *then* of the preceding clause looked back argumentatively to the occurrences that had taken place. The *that* of this clause looks forward reduplicatively to a fresh statement of the case.—Schenkel thinks that there was no other miracle than merely a wonderful self-collected calmness, on the part of our Lord, amid the tempest! "How much more exalted," says he, "and exalting is Jesus "standing there amidst the increasing danger, surrounded by the trembling, "experienced seafarers, in spite of the despair of the steersman,—standing "there in holy self-possession, rebuking, tranquillizing, and encouraging them,— "an image of perfect faith in God and of the clearest insight into his own "destiny." "He had," says Schenkel, "immovable faith in his destiny, "unwavering conviction that his hour had not yet come, that he had yet to do "the great work of his life; and hence the accident of a storm could not disturb "the divine plan for the salvation of mankind." (*Charakterbild Jesu*, x, 1.) He does not notice that if he ascribes to Jesus a really "divine plan for the salvation of mankind," which required to be wrought out to completion in his individual personality, he really introduces at another point the very element of the supernatural, which he seeks to withdraw from the Saviour's relationship to the winds and the waves. It need not be added, besides, that if Schenkel's theory be right, Mark's narrative is wrong.

## CHAPTER V.

FROM the 1st to the 20th verse we have a minute narrative of the deliverance of the Gerasene demoniac. See the corresponding paragraphs in Matt. viii, 28—34, and Luke viii, 26—39.

*of the sea, he was importuned by Jairus, a ruler of the synagogue, to come and heal his daughter*, 21—23. *On his way to the ruler's house, a woman, who had been afflicted many years with an issue of blood, touched his garment and was forthwith healed*, 24—34. *He proceeded to the house of Jairus and restored the damsel*, 35—43.

AND they came over unto the other side of the sea,

---

VER. 1. *And they came to the other side of the sea, to the country of the Gadarenes*:—Or rather, *of the Gerasenes*, or *of the Gergesenes*. There can be no doubt that *Gadarenes* is an erroneous reading, although it is found in the Alexandrine Manuscript and the Ephræmi (A C), as well as in E F G H K M Ss Vs, and in the Peshito Syriac version, and the text of the Philoxenian Syriac, and the Gothic. It had evidently become an extensively diffused reading when once it did get into the manuscripts. Gadara was a well-known Jewish town, celebrated for its warm springs, and not very far from the sea of Galilee. It was a good many miles distant, however, and lay to the south-east of the lake. Unhappily Erasmus inserted *Gadarenes* in his editions, and Robert Stephens followed him, and then Beza; and thence it got into our Authorized English version, although it is the word *Gergesenes* that is found in the parallel passage of Matt. viii, 28. *Gadarenes* was not the word in the oldest manuscripts. It is *Gerasenes* that is found in the Sinaitic and Vatican and Cambridge manuscripts, (ℵ B D), as also in the Italic and Vulgate versions. Origen too expressly mentions (i, 239, ed. *Lommat*) that *Gerasenes* was the general reading of the manuscripts, though in some "few" copies *Gadarenes* was found. He dismisses the reading *Gadarenes* as out of the question; but, in consequence of an orthographical misconception, he supposes that the prevalent reading *Gerasenes* was also corrupt, and he conjectured that *Gergesenes* should be substituted in its place. He was thinking of *the famous Gerasa*, an Arabian city a long way to the south-east of Gadara, one of the chief places in Decapolis, and exhibiting to this day "beautiful and extensive ruins." (See *Porter's Syria*, pp. 294—298.) This Gerasa is far removed, as he justly remarks, from "both sea and lake." It cannot be the place referred to. Hence he concluded that the reference is to *Gergesa*, an ancient city on the eastern shore of the lake of Gennesaret. Thenceforward *Gergesenes*, instead of *Gerasenes*, became a favourite reading in the manuscripts. It established itself in Matthew, and was given there by Erasmus. Epiphanius says expressly that *Gergesenes* is the reading of Mark (*Hæres*, lxvi, 33, p. 650). And so the word appears in L U Δ, 1, 33, and in the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac version, and in the Coptic, Armenian, Æthiopic, and Arabic versions. Origen was no doubt right geographically. The reference is to Geresa or Gersa or Kersa on the eastern margin of the sea of Galilee. But he was wrong in assuming that the old reading *Gerasenes* could not and did not refer to that very town. The two words, *Gerasenes* and *Gergesenes* are just two different ways of pronouncing one name. Origen's *Gergesa* is just the Evangelist's *Gerasa* and the modern *Kersa*. The ruins of the town lie to this day a little south of the Wady

[a] into the country of the Gadarenes. 2 And when [a] Mat. 8. 28. Lu. 8. 26.
he was come out of the ship, immediately there met
him out of the tombs a man with an [b] unclean [b] Mar. 1. 23.
spirit, 3 who had *his* dwelling among the [c] tombs; [c] Isai. 65. 4.
and no man could bind him, no, not with chains:

---

Semakh, which debouches into the lake nearly opposite Magdala. "It was "walled," says Dr. Porter, "and the remains of the wall can be traced. The "houses are all prostrate, and heaps of rubbish and hewn stones encumber the "site." —"The physical conformation of the country south of Kersa appears to "suit the incidents of the narrative better than any other spot along the "eastern shore of the lake." (*Syria and Palestine*, p. 401.)

VER. 2. *And when he was come out of the boat, immediately there met him out of the tombs a man with an unclean spirit*:—*Met*, or, more literally, *encountered* (ὑπήντησεν), —only the word conveys no hostile intent.—*Out of the tombs*:—The direction in which the man who is about to be specified came was *from the tombs*, not *from the town*. He did not live in the town. See next verse.—*A man*:—Matthew, in his account, makes mention of two. Nothing is more likely than that there should be more than one. There were no asylums for the insane in those days. The unhappy sufferers were scattered about; and sometimes individuals, when possessed of peculiar inter-relations of susceptibility, would draw together. There had been two thus associated in the neighbourhood of Kersa. But the personality of one of the two had been so strikingly outstanding and remarkable that the other individual had been apparently a mere semi-servile appendage. Hence Mark and Luke take notice only of the one. It is evident from this that Mark was no mere copyist and epitomizer of Matthew.—*With an impure spirit*:—The expression in the original is somewhat stronger, '*in*' *an impure spirit*. It is the same idiom that we employ when we speak of a man being '*in*' *a passion* or '*in*' *drink*. The demonic in the man was more conspicuous and obtrusive than the man's own manhood. Wycliffe and the Rheims version retain the primitive '*in*.' Tyndale paraphrases the expression *possessyd of an unclene sprete*. As to the existence of *demon-spirits*, and their *uncleanness*, see on chap. i, 23, 32.

VER. 3. *Who had his habitation among the tombs*: Or, more literally, *in the tombs*. Like many other maniacs, he had a melancholy craze for frequenting the places of the dead. He felt no interest, or almost none, in the society of the living. In the whole of Syria the mountains are pierced with old excavated tombs,—fit haunts for demoniacs. Dr. W. M. Thomson says expressly that "an immense mountain rises directly above Chersa, in which are ancient tombs." (*The Land and the Book*, p. 376.) Many of the existing Palestinian tombs belong to a period long anterior to the time of our Lord's ministry, and some of them to a period anterior to the occupancy of Palestine by the Hebrews.———*And no man could bind him, no, not with chains*:—Literally, *and not even with a chain was any man able as yet to bind him*, viz. effectively. See next verse. The expression *not even with a chain* is the literal translation of the proper reading, (οὐδὲ ἁλύσει instead of οὔτε ἁλύσεσιν). The plural *chains*, found in the Received Text, had been suggested, apparently, by the phraseology of the succeeding verse. It was common in Palestine, and till lately it was not

4 because that he had been often bound with fetters and chains, and the chains had been plucked asunder by him, and the fetters broken in pieces: neither could any *man* tame him. 5 And always, night and day, he was in the mountains, and in the tombs, crying, and cutting himself with

---

uncommon in Great Britain, to chain, with iron chains, such of the insane as were unfortunately furious or violent. No doubt it would be often a necessity; but it was sad and sadly humiliating to human nature.

VER. 4. *Because that* :–The evangelist explains why he said that no one as yet could (effectively) bind him even with a chain.———*He had been often bound with fetters and chains* :–The experiment had been often tried, with *fetters* specifically, and *chains* generically. The word *fetters*, like the corresponding word in Greek, properly means *shackles for the feet*. Compare the word '*fet*lock'—the lock of hair at the *feet* of horses. *Fet* is the Anglo-Saxon for *feet*. There is no reason for supposing, with Fritzsche, Bloomfield, Bland, and others, that the generic word *chains* refers, specifically and antithetically, merely to *manacles* or *handcuffs*.———*And the chains had been plucked asunder by him* :–Or, *pulled asunder*, (διεσπάσθαι);—by no means an unexampled degree of strength on the part of the maniacally violent, but yet incontestable evidence of a high type of phrenzy or full-fed "furor."———*And the fetters broken in pieces* :–Or *crushed together*, (συντετρῖφθαι), namely by the trampling of the feet. till at length they gave way. Wycliffe's version is picturesque, *and hadde broken the stockis to smale gobetis*, that is, *and had broken the stocks to small pieces*.———*Neither could any one tame him* :–No one could awe him into subjection. It is often the case that very violent maniacs are quite calm and submissive under the authoritative eye and bearing of instinctively commanding natures. But the Gerasene demoniac had not met any one who had power to soothe or to subdue him.

VER. 5. *And constantly, night and day, he was in the tombs and in the mountains* :–Such is the order of the words *tombs* and *mountains* in the best manuscripts. At one time he would be sitting moodily in an empty tomb; at another he would be roaming about excitedly over the mountains, 'in' the gorges and wild nooks, and wherever any sequestered haunts could be reached in the thickets or by the most precipitous crags.———*Crying*—no doubt with unearthly yells—*and cutting himself with stones* :–Instead of *cutting* Wycliffe and Coverdale have *beating*. Luther's word corresponds *(schlug)*. So Tyndale *(and bet him silfe with stones)*. The Geneva version is equivalent, *and strooke him self with stones*. But the translation of our Authorized Version is correct. The demoniac would use sharp-edged stones to cut and gash his person. There is sometimes a strong propensity in maniacs to wound and even to maim themselves. V. Swieten says that he himself "saw a maniac who lacerated all the integuments of his body, and who, during the inclemency of a severe winter, lay naked on straw for weeks, in a place rough with stones." *(Comment.* iii, p. 521.) When poor human nature is raving, the judgement is inverted, and the sensibility is benumbed. "Mania," says Feuchtersleben, "always proceeds from deceptive ideas and sensations." *(Medical Psychology*, p. 289.) "In insanity," says Dr. Mason Good, "the corporeal sensibility is greatly

stones. 6 But when he saw Jesus afar off, he ran and worshipped him. 7 and cried with a loud voice, and said, What have I to do with thee, Jesus, *thou* Son of the most high God? I adjure thee by God, that thou torment me not.

---

diminished; but not more so than the moral sensibility." (*Study of Medicine*, vol. iii, p. 88.)

VER. 6. *And*:—Such, instead of *But*, is the reading of the manuscripts ℵ B C L Δ, 1, 69. ——*When he saw Jesus afar off*:—Or, more literally, *from afar*. It is not the distance of Jesus from the demoniac that is noted; it is the other side of the case—the distance of the demoniac from Jesus. The Vulgate version (*a longe*), and Luther's and Bengel's (*von ferne*), are literal. ——*He ran and did obeisance to him*:—There might be a combination of influences at work within the poor demoniac's spirit. His own oppressed soul, on the one hand, might be sensitive to the "virtue" that was streaming out, we know not how far, from the divine personality of the Saviour. The oppressive demoniac spirits, on the other, might likewise be conscious of a power, far higher than their own, restraining them in part, and constraining them in part.

VER. 7. *And cried with a loud voice and said*:—Literally, *with a great voice*. ——*What have I to do with thee?*—Or rather, *What hast thou to do with me?* The idiomatic phrase is literally, *What to me and to thee?* It depends on the nature of the case, which of the two poles of interposition should be emphasised, and whether consequently we should say, *What have I to do with thee?* or reversely, *What hast thou to do with me?* See Chap. i, 24. ——*Jesus, Son of the most high God*:—The spirits, who had possession of the poor man's body, wielded his organism of speech as if it were their own. It is a marvel; but nevertheless it is, at bottom, no greater a mystery than the wielding of the same organism by the human spirit itself. The demoniac spirits seem everywhere to have known the Saviour. They would no doubt have means of telegraphy, as well as media of perception, far more delicate than our coarse corporeal organisms. When they called out, confessionally, *Jesus, Son of the most high God!* they might be conscious that there was a power above them laying its hand upon them, and thus extorting from them, involuntarily, a confession of the truth. In other circumstances, and more especially when promiscuous crowds were around, they might malignantly hope that the confession might be construed as a proof of collusion. ——*I adjure thee by God*:—Strauss carps at this, and thinks it an incredible adjuration on the part of "one who believed himself to be possessed by a demon hostile to God" (*Leben*, ii, 9, §. 89), or rather, as he should have said, on the part of a demon itself who knew that it was the enemy of God. But the objection is frivolous. Nothing is more common than swearing by God on the part of the ungodly, the infidel, and even the atheistic. ——*That thou torment me not*:—That is, that thou dismiss me not into the endurance of the torments reserved for spiritual rebels. Meyer supposes that this representation brings out a different idea from that which is expressed in Matthew viii, 29, *Art thou come hither to torment us 'before the time'?* Unreasonably however. In both representations the reference is alike to the final suffer-

8 For he said unto him, Come out of the man, *thou* unclean spirit. 9 And he asked him, What *is* thy name? And he answered, saying, My name *is* Legion: for we

---

ings of those who will not be submissive to the moral will of God. "Farther "curiosity as to the *when*, and *where*, and *how*, does not become" beings "whose main business and greatest wisdom is to fly from, not to pry too close into, these terrible secrets of the dark kingdom." (Bragge's *Observations on the Miracles*, vol. i, p. 74.)

VER. 8. *For he said unto him*:—Namely *before* the adjuration mentioned in the preceding verse. Hence the free translation of Tyndale brings out, interpretatively, the correct idea, *For he had said unto him.* Strauss (*Leben*, ii, 9, §. 89) and Bruno Bauer (*Kritik*, v, §. 33) insist that the representation is self-inconsistent. The inconsistency arises, says Bruno Bauer, from "pure inconsideration"! It is most inconsiderately said. For there is neither self-inconsistency, nor inconsistency with the accounts of the other synoptic evangelists. There is only simplicity of representation. The salient points and pinnacles of things are recorded. There is no attempt, and no profession of an attempt, at a systematic and chronological unfolding. Note the expression *unto 'him.'* There is, all through the narrative, to a greater or less degree, an interblending of reference to the man, and to the spirit or spirits who were in possession of him. No wonder that there should be such *verbal* interblending in the representation. There was *real* confusion in the composite phenomenon.———*Come out of the man, thou unclean spirit!*—There were in reality, as we learn from the next verse, many spirits. But one had spoken representatively, *What hast thou to do with 'me'?* and therefore the Saviour addresses it in the same representative capacity. We need not picture to ourselves a mere chaotic mob of spirits. There was a "legion;" and we may appropriately think, therefore, of some General of the corps.

VER. 9. *And he asked him, what is thy name?*—We have no reason to suppose that the question was proposed for the Saviour's own information. But, *seeing as he did into the spirit world*, he saw that this was a peculiar case, and hence he took appropriate means to unfold to the view of his disciples and of the other spectators, the fulness of the reality.———*And he answered saying*:—Or, according to the simpler reading of the best manuscripts (ℵABCKLMΔΠ) and also the best old versions, *and he says to him.* We are taken into the presence of the demoniac, and listen with our ears.———*Legion is my name, for we are many*:—It was the man, not the spirit, who was asked to tell his name. The man *seemed to answer*. It was his lips that moved. It was his voice that articulated. But it was really the representative spirit who spoke. He spoke, however, as if he were the man,—*Legion is 'my' name.* "He answered," says Farmer, in the Treatise in which he endeavours to prove that there were no real possessions, "like a madman, *who thought himself possessed with a multitude of demons, or that he was one of the number.*"—"He confounded himself with those spirits under whose influence he supposed himself to speak and act." (*Essay on the Demoniacs*, p. 273.) True, there was confusion. The man was insane, and misunderstood his own case. But his peculiar type of insanity is the very problem to be solved. And there seems to be no

are [d] many. 10 And he besought him much that [d] Mat. 12. 45. Mat. 26. 53.

---

solution of it more reasonable than the evangelist's. He was "possessed."—*Legion*:—A Roman word, denoting a corps of foot soldiers, to the number of between six and seven thousand, at least in the evangelist's time. Each legion consisted of ten cohorts. Each cohort of three maniples. Each maniple of two centuries. It is most likely that it was the man himself who imposed on himself, for the moment, the name. But we need not, from the fact that it was a Latin name, infer with Semler (*De Demoniacis*, p. 82), that the man was probably a Hellenist, or a proselyte, who could not speak Hebrew. Lightfoot, however, had the same idea. The word "legion" was likely enough to fasten itself upon the popular Jewish mind as a term vividly representing the idea of overwhelming numbers. The poor man no doubt *felt overwhelmed*, and hence, in his hallucination, transferred his consciousness, as it would appear, to the overwhelming force. Such a transference of consciousness, or what appears to be such, is quite common in certain cases of insanity. Many of the inmates of our asylums imagine themselves to be kings, or queens, or angels, or Christ, or God, or,—descendingly,—beasts, birds, or inanimate things.—*For we are many*:—At this point in the interview, the transference of the poor man's consciousness from the singular to the plural seems to have taken place. Or, to represent the case otherwise, the man's personality got merged at this point out of view, and the host of spirits, that had possession of him, came into the foreground of observation. Strauss maintains that such possession of an individual man by a multiplicity of spirits is "unthinkable" (*undenkbar*). He reasons the matter (*Leben*, ii, 9, §. 89). He says that to possess is, by hypothesis, "nothing else than to make oneself the subject of consciousness in an individual." A possessed person therefore is one who has ceased to be the subject of his own consciousness. But, adds he, as consciousness can actually have only one culminating or central point, (*nur eine Spitze, einen Mittelpunckt haben kann*), it is impossible to think that a plurality of demons would at the same time have possession of the man. The utmost that can be thought is that there may have been a succession in possession. Strauss forgot, in his zeal, that insanity is, by hypothesis, *a state of inconsistency*. He confounds, too, the subject and the objects of consciousness. The man, in the unity of his own subjective consciousness seemed to himself to be objectively conscious of a plurality of demons usurping his powers and being. There was, of course, a hallucination of consciousness. But in no instance is possession so complete by hypothesis as to obliterate entirely every vestige of the original self-consciousness.

VER. 10. *And he besought him much*:—The consciousness of the man swung back to himself. Hence the *he* after the *we* of the preceding clause.—*Much*: The word is plural in the original, (πολλά), and suggests repeated entreaties. Instead of *much*, Tyndale, followed by Coverdale and the Geneva, has *instantly*, that is, *insistingly, pressingly*.———*That he would not send them*:—The *that* of the original (ἵνα) does not point out the subject-matter of the entreaty, but its final end. The idea is, *in order that he might not send them*. The demons, in pleading through the man, had a particular end in view. Let no one marvel

he would not send them away out of the country. 11 Now there was there nigh unto the mountains a great herd of

---

at the fact of their pleading or the fact of their aim. They had desires. They could not but have them. And having them, what wonder that they should express them?———*Out of the country*:–They had become localized in their associations. And why not? All *human spirits* are. All spirits, but the infinite, must be, to a greater or less degree. The local reference, however, is not, as Hilgenfeld supposes (*Evangel.* p. 134), a reference to heathendom, as the appropriate sphere of demoniacal possessions (*der eigentliche Wirkungskreis der Dämonen*). There is no evidence that Gerasa was regarded as strictly belonging to heathendom or Gentiledom. And still less is there evidence that demoniacal possession was regarded as a strictly heathenish or Gentile experience. Neither is the representation in Luke—*and they besought him that he would not command them to depart into 'the abyss,'* (viii, 31)—at variance, as Bruno Bauer alleges (*Kritik*, v, §. 33), with the representation in Mark. Expatriation would have been to the Gerasene demons tantamount to banishment into the abyss of woe. (See verse 7). In petitioning, therefore, *not to be sent out of the country*, they would really mean, *not to be sent into the abyss*. It is assumed in the twofold representation that there would, for them, be no intermediate sphere available. Another country on earth was not to be thought of, and was not thought of, as an alternative localization.

Ver. 11. *Now there was there*:–*Now* or *But*, (δέ). The attention is suddenly turned, for the moment, in a new direction.———*Nigh unto the mountains*:–Or rather, *nigh to the mountain*, or *close to the mountain*, (πρὸς τῷ ὄρει). Such is the reading of *all* the uncial manuscripts, and thus of all the critical editors, inclusive even of Bengel, Griesbach, Matthaei, Scholz. The meaning is, *at the base of the mountain*. At the place referred to, a little to the south of the Wady Semakh, there is a considerable uneven plateau of fine fertile soil stretching westward from the roots of the mountain-slopes. "A verdant "sward is here," says Mr. Macgregor, "with many bulbous roots which swine "might feed upon. And on this I observed—what is an unusual sight—a very "large herd of oxen, horses, camels, sheep, asses, and goats, all feeding "together. It was evident that the pasturage was various, and enough for "all,—a likely place for *a herd of swine feeding on the mountain.*" (*The Rob Roy on the Jordan*, p. 423.)———*A great herd of swine feeding*:–Not a right kind of herd for a Jew, or for Jews, to possess. The animal was "unclean" to the Jews (Lev. xi, 7; Deut. xiv, 8) as it was also to the Egyptians. (*Herod.* ii, 47.) It was prohibited as one of a class of animals; but possibly the limits of the class were determined, to some extent, by reasons that had special reference to it, as an individual species. (See Isai. lxv, 4.) There can be no doubt that there was something exceedingly disgusting, and morally contaminating, connected with the use that was made of the animal in Egypt. (See Herodot. ii, 47.) Similar customs, less modified and moderated by restrictions, may have been common in adjacent countries. (See Pausanias vii, 15, 7.) And hence it might be wise, in the peculiar ethical circumstances of the Jews, that the use of the animal should be prohibited altogether for the whole course of a Dispensation. If, in addition to this, it should be the case,

[e] swine feeding. 12 And all the devils besought him, saying, Send us into the swine, that we may enter into them. 13 And forthwith Jesus gave them leave. And the unclean spirits went out, and entered into the swine:

[e] Lev. 11. 7. Deut. 14. 8.

---

as many have contended, that the flesh of the animal must have been dietetically injurious among a people, in whom there was a sort of national tendency to leprosy and corresponding erosive affections, as well as other eruptive and contagious cutaneous diseases, then there would be reason upon reason for the prohibition. If the Canaanites, moreover, were eaters of swine's flesh, and fond of it, that may have been another good reason for the prohibition, for, as Michaelis remarks, "the most intimate friendships are formed at table." "Men," he adds, "whatever business-relations they may have with one another, seldom become familiar if they do not become each other's guests." (*Mosaisches Recht*, §. 203.) The Gerasenes must have got Gentilized in their ideas and customs, and languid in their attachment to the Institutions of Judaism.

VER. 12. *And all the demons besought him*:—In the manuscripts ℵ B C L Δ, 1, 69, the expression *all the demons* is wanting. It is omitted by Tregelles, Alford, and Tischendorf in his 8th edition,—so that, according to their texts, the clause runs thus, *And they besought him.* It is likely that this is the simple original reading.———*Saying, Send us into the swine,*—or rather *Send us 'to' the swine,*—*that we may enter into them*: How could there, it is asked, be such a desire on the part of the demons? Why should there not? we would answer. We do not feel called upon to enter into the rationale of demonic desires, and to find them in harmony with our notions of what is reasonable or proper. The wish might, on their part, be a mere outburst of wantonness. Or there might be eagerness for *anything* on which to wreck their evil energy. They might be wishing, as Richard Baxter has it, "to play a small game rather than none." Or there might be cunning malice in their intent,—malice toward Christ and toward all the other parties concerned. "They aimed," as Petter thinks, "at "this, that they might move the owners of the herd, and the rest of the people "of the country, to be discontented at our Saviour." It may be so, or it may not. We cannot tell.

VER. 13. *And he gave them leave*:—Such is the simple reading that is presented in the texts of Tischendorf and Tregelles, on the authority of the important manuscripts ℵ B C L Δ, 1, and of the Syriac-Peshito version, and the Coptic, and Armenian. "He *permitted* them," as the verb is sometimes rendered (1 Cor. xiv, 34; xvi, 7; Heb. vi, 3); or "he *suffered* them," as it is in other passages translated (Matt. viii, 21, 31; xix, 8; Luke viii, 32). "It was an injury done to the proprietors," says the scoffing Woolston, "and unbecoming of the goodness of the holy Jesus." (*Discourses on the Miracles*, i, 38.) But it was not, if the proprietors had no right to have such property, and if they were, moreover, the subjects or the stewards of Him who was the true King of the Jews.———*And the unclean spirits went out, and entered into the swine*:—"When it is averred," says Strauss, "that the demons actually entered the swine, do not the Evangelists narrate a manifest impossibility?" (*Leben*, ii, 9, §. 89.) No, they do not. The demonic power that was adequate to

and the herd ran violently down a steep place into the sea, (they were about two thousand), and were choked in the sea. 14 And they that fed the swine fled, and told *it* in the city, and in the country. And they went out to see what

---

take possession of the intricate organism of man's nature would be more than adequate to take possession of the simpler organism of beasts. If the castle of the human spirit could be surreptitiously entered and occupied, there could be little difficulty with the fortalices of irrational natures.———*And the herd ran violently* :–Or *rushed*, as the word is admirably rendered in Acts xix, 29. The movement was "with a greet birre," as Purvey has it. Wycliffe's expression is "with greet bire."———*Down a steep place into the sea*:–Literally, *down the steep*, the particular steep in which the plateau referred to terminated, close on the waters of the lake. "There are several steeps near the sea here," says Mr. Macgregor, "but only one so close to the water as to make it sure "that if a herd *ran violently* down, they would go *into the sea*."—There "the "gravel beach is inclined so steep that when my boat was at the shore I could "not see over the top even by standing up; while the water alongside is so "deep that it covered my paddle (seven feet long) when dipped in vertically a "few feet from the shore." (*The Rob Roy on Jordan*, pp. 423-4.)———*To about the number of two thousand* :–Such is the import of the simple unparenthetical expression, as found in ℵ B C* D L Δ, 1, and exhibited in the texts of Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, (ὡς δισχίλιοι). It is supported, too, by the Vulgate version.———*And were choked in the sea* :–A vivid mirroring, in a particular outward sphere, of the lamentable wrecking of things that would speedily be realised, if the demonic powers that are in the world had full and unfettered scope.

Ver. 14. *And they who were feeding them* :–For it is the pronoun *them*, and not the phrase *the swine*, that is found in the manuscripts ℵ B C D L Δ, and in the Vulgate, Coptic, Syriac-Peshito, and Æthiopic versions.———*Fled and reported in the city and in the country* :–Our word *reported* corresponds as nearly as may be to the radical import of the Evangelist's term, (ἀπήγγειλαν, not ἀνήγγειλαν. So ℵ A B C D K L M Π). We can use, too, the word *reported* "absolutely," just as the Evangelist has used his term. The Rheims version is *carried news*. The double-folding expression *in the city and in the country* is a free but admirable translation. It is literally *into the city and into the fields*, and would be connected, in the Evangelist's mind, not with the verb *reported*, as Lightfoot imagined, but with the preceding verb *fled*. The scene pictures itself readily and vividly upon the canvas of the imagination. There were several individuals tending the herd. The moment that they recover from the first stun which they would experience when they witnessed the consummated catastrophe of the herd, they flee, under the influence of intense excitement, first *into the city*, and then *into the surrounding fields*, where numbers of the inhabitants would be at work. They shout aloud, wherever they meet with individuals, that *the whole herd has rushed into the sea and is drowned, and that the wild man of the tombs is quite peaceable and in his senses !*———*And they came out to see what it is that has happened* :–*They*, the people of the city, and the workers in the fields. They were filled with blank amazement at the

it was that was done. 15 And they come to Jesus, and see him that was possessed with the devil, and had the legion, sitting, and clothed, and in his right mind: and they were [f] afraid. 16 And they that saw *it* told them how it befell to him that was possessed with the devil, and *also* concerning the swine. 17 And they began to pray him to [g] depart out of their coasts.

[f] 1 Sam. 12. 18. Job 13. 11. Psa. 14. 5. Psa. 65. 8.

[g] Job 21. 14. Luke 5. 8. Acts 16. 39.

---

report which was shouted into their ears, and could not at first comprehend the state of the case. They must come and "see" with their own eyes. *They came out*, or simply *they came*, (ἦλθον), as Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Alford have it in their texts.

VER. 15. *And they come to Jesus*:–Note the present *come*, as distinguished from the historic *came* of the preceding verse. The Evangelist begins to depict the scene as if he and we were present in the midst of it and looking on.——— *And (they) behold the demoniac sitting clothed and in sound mind*:–Note the word *behold*, (θεωροῦσιν). It is more than *see*. They gaze upon the man. Note also that there is no *and* between *sitting* and *clothed*. There is none in the manuscripts ℵ B D L Δ, 1, 33—"the queen of the cursives," and 69, or in the Italic, Vulgate, Coptic, and Armenian versions. It is omitted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles. There is a fine harmony, too, between the statement that the demoniac was now *clothed*, and the statement in Luke that formerly he "ware no clothes," (viii, 27). The two statements are incidental coincidences, which mutually confirm each other's historic verity. The coincidence is so striking that Ewald (*Evan.* p. 241) had to imagine that the expression "he wore no clothes" must have originally stood in the 3d verse of Mark's narrative! And Holtzmann (*Synop. Ev.* p. 222) supposes that Luke took the hint, from the Proto-Marcus's remark, to insert the statement "anticipatively." Fancies and myths! It is Tyndale to whom we are indebted for the fine translation *in his right mind*. The Rheims version is *well in his wittes*. Wycliffe's version is *of hoole mynde*.———*Him who had the legion*: Such is the proper position of this clause. The contrast of the man's former condition sets off to advantage the marvel of his present state. *Yes, the very individual who was now 'sitting clothed and sound in mind' was 'he who had the legion'!*———*And they were afraid*: They felt in the presence of a power which inspired them with awe and alarm. It might, for aught that they could comprehend, be something weird or "uncanny."

VER. 16. *And they who saw narrated to them how it happened to the demoniac*:–How the things, which had taken place, did take place, in reference to the demoniac; or, as the Rheims version has it, *in what manner he had been dealt withal that had the divel.*———*And concerning the swine*:–The spectators,—who would no doubt be principally, if not exclusively, the same persons who had carried the news excitedly into the city and into the fields, and who would return to the scene of the miracle with the body of the people,—recounted and explained in detail all that had happened "concerning the swine." The two clauses which specify the things recounted are inartificially connected.

VER. 17. *And they began to entreat him to depart from their bounds*:–Namely,

18 And when he was come into the ship, he that had been possessed with the devil prayed him that he might be with him. 19 Howbeit Jesus suffered him not, but saith unto him, Go home to thy friends, and [h] tell them how

[h] Psa. 34. 11. Psa. 66. 16. Phil. 2. 16.

---

after they got to understand somewhat clearly how the events had come to pass. They were afraid that they might suffer other losses. Perhaps they were keeping in possession other contraband goods. They were afraid, at all events, of the practical consequences of having such a wonderful Being, as Jesus, in the midst of them. "With unparallelled———what shall I "call it?—'tis a crime that wants a name, and such as one would think "people that were not themselves possessed could never be capable of com- "mitting,—they were urgent with him to be gone and leave them."—"And "yet if we consider it, is not the case just thus with too many amongst our- "selves?"—"Are we not afraid of anything that would oblige us to a "reformation? Shy of a faithful friend who would advise us better?—and "that because our swine would be in danger!" (Bragge's *Observations on the Miracles*, vol. i, pp. 79-82.)

VER. 18. *And as he is entering into the boat*:—Such is the translation of the best supported reading, (ἐμβαίνοντος instead of ἐμβάντος). It is the reading of the manuscripts ℵ A B C D K L M Δ Π, 1, 33, and is accepted, as might be anticipated, by all the modern critical editors.———*The delivered demoniac entreats him that he may be with him*: The clause, *that he may be with him*, brings out rather the aim, than the subject-matter, of the entreaty, (ἵνα). It is probable that the man's heart was swelling with gratitude and love. He would feel ashamed, too, of the conduct of his countrymen. Euthymius Zigabenus and Theophylact suppose that, in addition, he would probably be afraid that, if his deliverer should be at a distance from him, he would again be subject to assault from his old spiritual enemies. Maldonato and Dr. Samuel Clarke bring out the same idea.

VER. 19. *And he suffered him not*:—Such is the simple form of the expression as it is given, correctly, in the texts of Griesbach, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford. Hilgenfeld (*Evan.* p. 148) supposes that the refusal to allow the delivered man to go along with our Lord bewrays—*on the part of Mark*—an anti-Gentile tendency. The whole Gospel is thus assumed to be a myth that was contrived in the interests of a small theological dogma and narrow ecclesiastical, Jewish-Christian, movement!———*But says to him, Go home to thy own folk*:—Literally, *to those who are thine*, or as Wycliffe has it, *to thine*. Very literally, it is, *to the thine*, which however, though idiomatic Greek, is not idiomatic English.———*And tell them*:—Literally, *report to them*, (ἀπάγγειλον αὐτοῖς,—the reading of ℵ B C Δ, and of Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles), or, *announce to them*, (ἀνάγγειλον αὐτοῖς,—the reading of the Textus Receptus and the Alexandrine manuscript (A), and the great body of the secondary uncial manuscripts).———*How great things the Lord hath done for thee*:—Or rather *to thee*. What the Lord had done terminated *on* and *in* the person of the delivered man, and thus reached *to* him. It is only, however, from the history of the case, and from the peculiarity of the expression in the next clause, that we

great things the Lord hath done for thee and hath had compassion on thee. 20 And he departed, and began to publish in Decapolis how great things Jesus had done for him: and all *men* did marvel.

---

know that the things done *on*, *in*, and *to* him were *for* him, and not *against* him. The Saviour, in saying *the Lord*, does not point to his own particular personality. He simply leads the man's mind upward, in a general way, to *the Divine Source* of the great things which had been done to him.———*And compassionated thee*: Or, *and had mercy on thee*. Here it is distinctly stated that the great things done were *for* the man. The expression, however, is very artlessly attached to the preceding clause. The mind of the reader is left to disintegrate, from the somewhat compositely qualitative expression *how great things* or *what great things*, (ὅσα), the simplest qualitative element of "conjunctive" thought—*how* (quasi ὡς, see Luke viii, 47, xxiv, 35), or *how that*, or *that*, (ὅτι), and to carry it forward to be combined with the attached verb. Hence Tyndale's translation, *and 'how' he had compassion on thee*.———The Saviour, instead of imposing silence on this delivered demoniac, as he did on so many others, encourages and enjoins him to make proclamation of his miraculous deliverance. No doubt he saw, on the one hand, that the man was fit for the evangelistic work committed to him, and that he needed it besides, while he knew, on the other, that there would not be reason for apprehending, as the result of his labours, any formidable addition to the inconvenient crowding to which he himself was subjected.

VER. 20. *And he departed*:-He acted, in the promptest manner, on his deliverer's injunction.———*And began to publish*: To proclaim like a herald, *to preach* as Wycliffe has it. The word is most frequently, in other passages of the New Testament, translated *to preach*.———*In Decapolis*: Literally, *in the Decapolis*, that is, *in the district of the Ten Cities*. It was a district that would seem to have varied in its boundaries from time to time; and hence there is not perfect unanimity in the ancient writers in reference to all the cities which originally gave it its name. It lay, for the most part, east of the Jordan, and east and south-east of the sea of Tiberias. Bethshean, however, or Scythopolis, on the west side of the river, was, according to Josephus, "the largest city of Decapolis." (*War*, iii, 9, 7.) Among its other cities were Pella, Gadara, Gerasa, Hippos. (See *Relandi Palæstina*, pp. 203-4.) Pliny says (v, 18) that Damascus, too, belonged to the "Decapolitan region." But this could not be the case in the time of Josephus, since he says that Scythopolis, which was of course far inferior in size to Damascus, was the largest city of the district. The word *Decapolis* occurs three times in the New Testament, (see Matt. iv, 25; Mark vii, 31), and, as Reland says, twice in the writings of Josephus.———*How great things*:-Or, *what great things*, or simply, as Alford gives it, *what things*. It is the same word that occurs in the 19th verse. In both passages it is rendered by Purvey, and in the Rheims, *how great things*. Tyndale, again, in his 1534 edition, renders it *what great things*, while, in his preceding edition of 1526, he renders it, as Alford has done, *what things*.———*Jesus did to him*:-The delivered man identified in his mind what God the Lord had done, with what Jesus did. *Christ*, says Euthymius Zigabenus, *had modestly ascribed the*

21 And when Jesus was passed over again by ship unto the [i] other side, much people gathered unto him: and [i] Mat. 9. 1.
he was nigh unto the sea. 22 And, behold, [j] there [j] Mat. 9. 18. Luke 8. 41.
cometh one of the rulers of the synagogue, Jairus
by name; and when he saw him, he fell at his feet, 23 and
besought him greatly, saying, My little daughter lieth at
the point of [k] death: *I pray thee,* come and lay thy [k] Psa. 107. 18.

---

*work to the Father; but the healed man gratefully ascribes it to Christ.* He would not, however, be thinking of any fine theological distinctions.———*And all marvelled*:–They could not help marvelling, though in too many cases the appropriate moral result would probably be hindered by the 'idols of the cave,' and 'the idols of the theatre,' and 'the idols of the market place.'

Ver. 21. *And when Jesus was passed over in the boat to the other side*:–The western side of the lake of Gennesaret, and no doubt to that part of it where Capernaum was situated. See Matt. ix, 1.———*Much people gathered unto him*:–Or, literally, *a great crowd was gathered upon him.* The expression *upon him,* (ἐπ' αὐτόν) graphically indicates that the people came pressing *close upon his person.*———*And he was by the sea-shore*:–Or, very literally, *beside the sea.* He was there while the events about to be recorded began to transpire.

Ver. 22. *And behold*:–This *behold* has not unlikely been carried into the text from the margin. It is found in Matthew (ix, 18) and Luke (viii, 41); but it is wanting here in the Sinaitic, Vatican, and Cambridge manuscripts (ℵ B D) and L Δ, as also in the Vulgate, Syriac-Peshito, Coptic, Æthiopic, and Arabic versions. It is omitted by Tischendorf and Alford.———*One of the rulers of the Synagogue*:–For, in general at least, there was a plurality of rulers or elders in every synagogue. (See Acts xiii, 15; and compare Vitringa *De Synagoga*, p. 582ff.) It was their duty to conduct or superintend the services of the congregation. The word that is here employed by the Evangelist, and correctly rendered *rulers-of-the-synagogue,* is, in the singular, incorrectly rendered '*chief*'-*ruler-of-the-synagogue* in Acts xviii, 8, 17.———*By name Jairus*: Or *Ja-îrus,* or very literally *Ya-eiros,* the Grecised form of the Jewish name *Jair* or *Ya-ir.* It is a significant Hebrew name, meaning *He will enlighten.* Josephus Grecises it into *Ya-eires (Antiq.* v, 7, 6).———*And when he saw him,* after penetrating perhaps through the surrounding crowd, *he fell at his feet*:–Literally, *falls.* We are taken back in imagination, and see him in the act of prostration. *At his feet*:–Literally *toward his feet,* (πρὸς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ). With beautiful oriental facility, he would drop upon his knees, and bring his forehead to the ground, *in the direction of the Saviour's feet.*

Ver. 23. *And besought him greatly*:–Or, according to the reading of ℵ A C L. 33, and Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, *and beseeches him much,* (παρακαλεῖ, instead of παρεκάλει). His heart was full, and he urged his plea.———*Saying, My little daughter lieth at the point of death*:–She was, Luke tells us, *about twelve years of age* (viii, 42). He tells us too that she was an only child. Perhaps she was lovely and engaging. At all events the father's heart was bound up in her. She was now, from some illness or other, "in extremity," (ἐσχάτως ἔχει—an idiom of the later Greek. See Lobeck's Phrynichus, p. 389).———*In order that thou mightest come and lay thy hands upon her*:–The father's

[l] hands on her, that she may be healed; and she [l] Mark 1. 41.
shall live. 24 And *Jesus* went with him; and Mark 6. 5.
much people followed him, and thronged him. 25 And a
certain woman, which had an [m] issue of blood twelve [m] Lev. 15. 19.
years, 26 and had suffered many things of many physicians,
and had spent all that she had, and was [n] nothing [n] Job 13. 4.
Psa. 108. 12. Jer. 30. 12.

address, as he spoke with choking voice, is abrupt and fragmentary, or else only fragments of it are recorded. When he prostrated himself, and spoke of the condition of his little daughter, it was *in order that the Saviour might come and lay his hands upon her.* He seems to have known that it was the Saviour's practice *to lay his hands* on such as he cured. It established, and exhibited, a human connection between his divine power and the patient.——*That she might be saved and live*:—Such is the literal translation. *That she might be saved*, viz. from her malady. *And live*, (καὶ ζήσῃ):—Such is the reading of ℵ B C D L Δ, and Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford.

Ver. 24. *And he went off with him*: Namely, in the direction of the ruler's house. He had no misgivings about his own power, and he was satisfied with the ruler's faith.——*And a great crowd were following him, and thronging him*: They were pressing together upon his person, (συνέθλιβον αὐτόν). *Thronged* is Tyndale's fine word. It was accepted by Coverdale, the Geneva, and the Rheims. Wycliffe had *oppresside*, Purvey *thruste*.

Ver. 25. *And a certain woman*:—Or simply, according to the reading of ℵ A B C L Δ, and of the Vulgate, Coptic, Philoxenian-Syriac, and Æthiopic versions, *and a woman*. Eusebius (*Hist.* vii, 18) records a tradition that she was a Gentile, a resident of Cæsarea-Philippi or Paneas. It was likewise reported that she caused to be erected in front of her residence a bronze (or copper) monument in commemoration of her cure. It consisted of two statues; one representing herself in the attitude of supplication, another representing her Deliverer, our Lord. Eusebius adds that he himself had seen the monument,—though we should rather suppose that popular tradition had only capriciously associated the old work of art with the miracle of the passage before us. ——*Who had been afflicted with an issue of blood for twelve years*:—Such is Edgar Taylor's translation. In speaking of the case, the technical term *hemorrhage* may be fitly employed.

Ver. 26. *And had suffered much of many physicians*:—Or, as Wycliffe gives it, *of ful many lechis*. The preposition rendered *of* (ὑπό) properly means *from under*. She had been *under* many physicians, and had suffered much, not only from her malady, but also from their methods of cure. They had attempted strong or severe remedies. Lightfoot gives a graphic account of some of the prescriptions that were used by the Rabbinical doctors. (*Heb. and Talmud. Exer.* in loc.) They were certainly severe enough. Webster and Wilkinson suppose that the Evangelist's expression only means that the woman had been "subject to much treatment." But the verb translated *suffered* has, in New Testament Greek, invariable reference to *a passive experience of pain*. See Matt. xvi, 21; xvii, 12; Luke xxii, 15; Acts i, 3; xvii, 3; Heb. xiii, 12; 1 Pet. iv, 15; v, 10, &c. Gal. iii, 4 is no exception.——*And had expended all her*

bettered, but rather grew worse, 27 when she had heard of Jesus, came in the press behind, and touched his garment. 28 For she said, If I may [o]touch but his clothes, I shall

[o] 2 Ki. 13. 21. Mat. 14. 36. Acts 5. 15. Acts 19. 12.

---

*resources*, (τὰ παρ' ἑαυτῆς πάντα) :–Literally *all the things which were from beside her*. She had spared no expense, within the reach of her circumstances, to get the best medical advice and treatment.———*And was nothing benefitted, but had rather grown worse* :–Or, as Tyndale gives the last clause, *but wexed worsse and worsse*, or, as Petter has it, "was the worser." It was, in short, a very bad case, inaccessible to all ordinary methods of cure.

Ver. 27. *Having heard concerning Jesus* :–What a wonderful Being, and in particular what a wonderful Healer, he was. She had, it would appear, made herself acquainted with his character and conduct. In some very important manuscripts (ℵ B C Δ, 33) the expression runs thus, *Having heard 'the (things)' concerning Jesus*, (τά). She had made herself acquainted with *the facts* of his career, and had thence come to believe that he was full of a Divine and Gracious Energy. He was. And it only needed that men should willingly receive it, in its fulness, in order to have realized within them the rectification of all their disorders, physical as well as moral.———*Came in the crowd behind, and touched his garment* : His outer garment, the garment that was worn above the tunic. It is rendered *cloke* in Matt. v, 40; Luke vi, 29; and *robe* in John xix, 2, 5. In the passage before us Principal Campbell renders it *mantle*. It was the peculiarity of this woman's touch that it was intentional, or voluntary. It was the touch of faith,—a touch consequently that indicated and consummated the unreserved opening up of her entire being to the influx of the Saviour's influence.

Ver. 28. *For she said* :–Viz., to herself within herself. See Matt. ix, 21. ———*If I should touch though it were but his garments* :–Such is the real idea embodied in the original expression, (κἂν τῶν ἱματίων αὐτοῦ). It has been partially missed by many translators. It was seized, however, by the Rheims translators, who were followed by the editors of our Authorized Version; and hence they put their *but* after *touch*, not before it as Tyndale had done, *yf I maye butt tewche his clothinge*. The *but*, thus correctly collocated by our Authorized Translators, as it was also by Luther, is transposed back to the wrong place by Mace, Pr. Campbell, Rodolphus Dickinson, Sharpe, Brameld. The same mistake is committed by Edgar Taylor and Godwin, although they employ the word *only* instead of *but*,—*if I can only touch his garments*. The woman's attention was fixed, not on her act of *touching* as contra-distinguished from some other mode of contact, but on the *garments* of our Lord as contra-distinguished from his person. It is an interesting fact that in the reading that is found in ℵ B C L Δ, and admitted into the editions of Tischendorf and Alford, the verb *touch* comes before the expression which we have rendered *though it were but his garments*. In the "Received Text" it comes after.—*Garments* :–The plural is used indefinitely,—*any part of his garments*. It would matter nothing at all, so far as efficacy was concerned, what portion should be touched.———*I shall be whole* :–Rather, *I shall be made whole*. Compare Matt. ix. 22. The idea is—

be whole. 29 And straightway the fountain of her blood was dried up; and she felt in *her* body that she was healed of that plague. 30 And Jesus, immediately knowing in himself that [p] virtue had gone out of him, turned him [p] Luke 6. 19. Luke 8. 46.

---

*I shall be delivered (from my malady).* Literally, *I shall be saved,*—and so the word is rendered in Luke xviii, 42.

Ver. 29. *And immediately the fountain of her blood was dried up*:—The cure was supernaturally instantaneous.———*And she felt in her body*:—Or rather, *And she knew by her body*, that is, *she knew by her bodily sensations.* Her *body*, that is, the state of her bodily sensations, was the means of her knowledge. Hence Euthymius Zigabenus explains the Evangelist's dative (τῷ σώματι) by the prepositional expression *through the body*, (διὰ τοῦ σώματος).———*That she had been healed of the plague*:—Not *of that plague*, as in the Authorized Version. We do not require a stronger demonstrative than our definitive article, which very precisely corresponds to the article employed in the original. Erasmus introduced into the third edition of his Latin version the demonstrative *that* ("ab eo flagello"). Beza approved of this translation, and adopted it: and hence the Geneva translation, and the coincident version of our Authorized Translators, *of that plague*. There was some excuse for Erasmus and Beza, in their Latin versions, as there is no article in the Latin language. But there is no reason why in English we should deviate from an exact reproduction of the original. And yet Principal Campbell, following Mace, as so frequently on other occasions, has *that*, as have also Wynne, Wakefield, Edgar Taylor, Thomson, Sharpe, Anderson. Luther's version, though free, is much better, "of *her* plague." The word *plague* is to be understood in its archaic and original meaning *—scourge*. See Chap. iii, 10. The Rheims gives a more generic rendering—*malady*. *'Off' the plague*:—Literally, *'off' the plague*, or *'from' the plague*. The verb *healed* is, as Fritzsche remarks, used pregnantly, so that the full idea is, *that she had been healed and thus delivered from the plague.*

Ver. 30. *And Jesus, immediately knowing*:—In the original the *immediately* stands before *Jesus*, and has reference, as we shall see, to what happened after the *knowing*. The Rheims inserts it in its right place, *and immediately, Jesus knowing*. The participle *knowing* is not present but præterite in the original, (ἐπιγνούς). We might hence render the phrase freely, *and immediately, as Jesus knew*. The compound verb, employed by the evangelist, has a stronger import than the simple verb, used in the preceding verse, and there translated *felt* in our Authorized Version. Our Lord *knew well*. He was *fully aware.*———*In himself*: That is, *in his own self-consciousness.* He did not need to reason inferentially on the matter. Neither did he need the testimony of his outer senses. Still less was it the case that "being secretly apprised of the woman's faith, and touch of him, he took the hint," as Woolston wantonly suggests. (*Discourse on Miracles*, ii, p. 16.)———*That virtue had gone out of him*:—Or more literally, and inartificially, and aggregatively, *the power that had gone forth from him.* The object of the Saviour's knowledge, in the sphere of his self-consciousness, was thus complex. It was, in the first place, his *virtue* or *power*, and, in the second place, the fact that this virtue or power had been *in*

about in the press, and said, Who touched my clothes? 31 And his disciples said unto him, Thou seest the multitude thronging thee, and sayest thou, Who touched me? 32 And he looked round about to see her that had done

---

*the act of transit from himself.* All the Old Translators, with the exception of Coverdale, use the word *virtue*, following in the wake of the Vulgate version, *(virtutem).* They mean by it, however, just *power*,—Coverdale's word. Wycliffe often uses the term in this acceptation. He speaks of Christ being "the son of God *in vertu*" (i.e., *in power*, Rom. i, 4). He speaks of the Gospel being "the *vertu of God* in to helthe," that is, "the *power of God* unto salvation" (Rom. i, 16). He translates 1 Cor. xv, 56 thus,—"Forsoth the prick of deeth is synne; forsoth *the vertu of synne* is lawe." Instead of the expression "most of his *mighty works*" in Matt. xi, 20, he has "ful manye *vertues*." But, in our Authorized Version, the Greek word is nowhere else rendered *virtue*, except in Luke vi, 19; viii, 46.——*Turned about in the crowd, and said, Who touched my garments?*–This he said only after he had *turned about*, and thus to those who had been behind him,—for he knew well in what direction his healing power had gone forth. Meyer thinks, however, that he did not know *upon whom* the power had taken effect. It is an entirely arbitrary idea, as well as *exegetically unlikely*, when the 32d verse is taken into account.

VER. 31. *And his disciples said to him, Thou seest the crowd thronging thee! and sayest!—(dost thou?)—Who touched me?*–We must suppose these words to have been spoken in a surprised tone of voice, that terminated in a real or virtual interrogation. Hence in the Rheims version, and thence in the Authorized Translation, we have *sayest thou*, instead of *thou sayest*, as in most other translations. The word rendered *thronging* is the term that is employed in verse 24. It admirably denotes the *united pressure*, on a person, of a crowd in contact.

VER. 32. *And he looked round about to see her who did this thing*: We are to suppose that, after she had touched his garment, she had shrunk back into the crowd. Perhaps she had never got perfectly close to his person. Most likely she would be able to accomplish her object only by stretching out her hand, as it were stealthily, between others. Hence our Saviour naturally *looked round about upon the crowd* to see her. He was in no haste to dart a direct glance upon her. The verb is in the imperfect tense,—*he was engaged for a while in looking round.* But of course his eye soon reached her; and no doubt it would rest benignantly upon her. So strange, however, is the power of prepossession to blind, Strauss cannot see that Mark meant that our Lord knew the individual who had believingly touched him. He argues keenly on the subject in both his works. *(Leben Jesu*, ii, §. 93; *Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk*, ii, 2, §. 75.) He holds the whole story to be a myth, and contends that it was in accordance with the natural growth of the myth, out of its original form as it occurs in Matthew, that Mark should represent our Lord's person as so wonderfully charged with a divinely curative power, that mere believing contact with it should suffice for a cure, *even while the Lord remained "ignorant,"* as Hilgenfeld too assumes, *of the individual who was drawing upon his resources!*

this thing. 33 But the woman fearing and trembling, knowing what was done in her, came and fell down before him, and [q] told him all the truth. 34 And he said unto her, [r] Daughter, thy [s] faith hath made thee whole; [t] go in peace, and be whole of thy plague.

[q] Rom. 10. 10.
[r] Mark 2. 5.
[s] Mark 10. 52. Luke 7. 50.
Luke 17. 19. Luke 18. 42. Acts 14. 9.
[t] 1 Sa. 1. 17. 1 Sa. 20. 42. 2 Ki. 5. 19.

---

VER. 33. *But the woman, fearing and trembling*: Or, still more literally and graphically, *afraid and trembling*, (φοβηθεῖσα καὶ τρέμουσα). She would be feeling that she had perhaps acted in too stealthy a way in reference to her wonderful Benefactor. Should she not have approached him openly? Should she not have formally petitioned his blessing?———*Knowing what was done in her*: Or rather, according to the reading of the Received Text, *knowing what had happened 'upon' her*, (ὁ γέγονεν ἐπ' αὐτῇ). In the reading, however, of the important manuscripts ℵ B C D L, there is neither *in* nor *upon* before the pronoun *her*. The phrase runs thus, "knowing what had happened (to) her," (αὐτῇ). This reading has been received into the text by Tregelles, Alford, and Tischendorf (in his 8th edition), and is supported by the two Syriac versions.———*Came and fell down before him, and told him all the truth*: Having had experience of her Benefactor's power, she added "confession with her mouth" to "faith in her heart." (Rom. x, 9, 10.) In making this confession, she threw herself, with rapid oriental ease and grace, into a beautiful attitude of obeisance. She *fell down before him.*

VER. 34. *But he said to her, Daughter, thy faith hath made thee whole*: Literally, *hath saved thee.* Compare verse 28. Her faith, of course had not been the Efficient Cause of her cure. Christ's power had been that. And behind his power, was his Person, the real Healer. But her faith was that *ethical condition of things* on her part, that rendered it fitting on his part to put forth his curative efficiency in her experience. It was the opening of the sluices of her being to the ingress of his overflowing energy as the great Rectifier of human disorders. Hence it might be represented as having, in a certain subordinate respect, "made her whole."—*Daughter*: A term of affection, but, no doubt, as employed by our Saviour, implying that all that was spiritually distinctive in her character had been *derived from himself.*———*Go thy way in peace*: Literally, though scarcely in harmony with English idiom, *go thy way into peace.* The Saviour looks at her *peace* prospectively. He sees that the woman would enjoy much of it in time to come. And hence instead of giving emphasis to what of it she was already experiencing, he turns attention to the future that was stretching out before her. *Peace* is only a partial aspect, but it is certainly an indispensable element, of comfort and bliss. It stood prominently out to view before the Hebrew mind. The other elements were silently subtended. A state of constant battle with trouble or troublers makes a sad defalcation in the amount of *happiness* realised.———*And be whole of thy plague*: Literally, *'from' thy plague.* The expression *be whole 'from'* is pregnant,—*be whole, (and thus delivered) from thy scourge.* Compare verse 29. There is a connection between *whole* and *heal*, as well as between *heal* and *hail*, and *whole* and *holy*. The Greek word (ὑγιής) rendered *whole* means *sound* or *healthy.* When the Saviour says *Be whole*, he, for the moment, ignores as it were the

35 While he yet spake, there came, from the ruler of the synagogue's *house, certain* which said, Thy daughter is [u] dead: why troublest thou the Master any further? [u] John 11. 14.
36 As soon as Jesus heard the word that was spoken, he saith unto the ruler of the synagogue, Be not afraid,

---

chronological fact that she was already whole, that he might bring logically into view the dependence of her past present and perspective *health* on the autonomy of his will.

VER. 35. *While he is yet speaking, there come from the ruler of the synagogue's house some who say* :–The phraseology is exceedingly inartificial. It is, in the original, *there come from the ruler of the synagogue*, and yet the ruler of the synagogue is the person *to whom* the message is delivered.——*Thy daughter is dead* :–The verb is in the aorist tense. Her death is now a *past* event.——*Why troublest thou the Master any further?*–The Master, that is, *the Teacher, the Rabbi.* The whole expression is a phrase of politeness. It assumes that the visit of the Great Teacher would most likely be a somewhat irksome addition to his already too numerous and overwhelming engagements. Hence the word rendered *troublest* is very strong in the original, *excoriatest*, (σκύλλεις). Tyndale and the Geneva render it *diseasest*, that is, *dis-easest.* It was Coverdale who gave the admirable translation *troublest.*—*Any further* :–*Yet, still,*—now that there is no prospect of any benefit being derived from his visit. It did not occur to them that restoration to life could be a possibility.

VER. 36. *But Jesus immediately –having overheard the word that was spoken— says to the ruler of the synagogue* :–Such we conceive to be the correct and literal reproduction in English of the authentic text of the Evangelist. (1.) Note the *immediately*—Mark's favourite adverb, (chap. i, 21). Lachmann and Alford put it within brackets, as of doubtful genuineness. Tregelles and Tischendorf (in his 8th edition) omit it altogether on the authority of ℵBDLΔ, and of the Vulgate version (and a majority of Italic manuscripts), as also of the Syriac-Peshito, Coptic, Armenian, and Æthiopic versions, &c. Mill condemned it. Its somewhat awkward position, however, makes it more likely,—in accordance with Bengel's critical canon *(scriptioni proclivi præstat ardua)*,—that it would be omitted than that it would be intruded by transcribers. It is found in A C Π and other nine uncial manuscripts, and in the Gothic and Philoxenian-Syriac versions, as also in the "a" copy of the Italic version *(statim)*. (2.) We might connect the *immediately* with the participle *overheard*,—*But Jesus, having 'immediately overheard' the word that was spoken, says.* It is more probable, however, that the Evangelist made—in an inartificial manner—a pause after writing *immediately*, and mentally suspended the continuity of his expression till he reached the word *says.* He meanwhile interposed the statement *having overheard the word that was spoken.* Hence Schöttgen puts commas after *immediately* and the expression *the word spoken.* It is more likely, in short, that the Evangelist desired to draw attention to the fact that Jesus *spoke immediately*, than to the fact that he *overheard immediately.* (3.) Note the word *overheard*, (παρακούσας). It has been introduced into the text by Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, on the authority of ℵ*BLΔ and the Italic "e" *(neglexit)*. It is undoubtedly the genuine autographic reading,—the simple

[v] only believe. 37 And he suffered no man to follow [v] Mark 9. 23.
him, [w] save Peter, and James, and John the brother [w] Mark 9. 2. Mark 14. 33.
of James. 38 And he cometh to the house of
the ruler of the synagogue, and seeth the tumult, and

---

*heard* of the Received Text having been borrowed out of Luke's narrative (viii, 50). This simple *heard* was all the more likely to be substituted for *overheard*, as the term rendered *overheard* means, not *overheard* but *disregarded*, in the only other passage in which it occurs in the New Testament. See Matt. xviii, 17. This meaning of *disregarded*, indeed, was here given to the term by the author of the Italic manuscript "e," and it is contended for by Meyer. Klostermann too gives it. But unnaturally. If the message had been addressed to Jesus himself, the term might have borne the meaning of *disregarded*, for then we might think of our Lord as *listening aside*, or as *listening to what was said to him, carelessly* as it were, or *inattentively*. But the case is quite different, when the message was not at all addressed to him, or meant for his ears. He *heard it aside* however, that is, *overheard* it, for doubtless it would not be merely whispered. Such is the interpretation that is given to the term by Ewald, Alford, Lange, Bisping.——*Fear not, only believe*:–Fear not for the result. Have faith in me that I shall meet the desire of your heart. *If this be the state of your mind, it is all that is needed. 'Only believe,'—I ask no more.* How sublime the self-possession of our Lord! How complete the self-consciousness that he held in his hand the key of all the resources of infinite power! Relatively to that power, it was of no moment whether the child was dead or alive. Could our Lord, or could any honest and worthy individual, have thus spoken to the agitated father, if his power had been limited?

VER. 37. *And he suffered no one to follow in his company*, (μετ' αὐτοῦ συνακολουθῆσαι), *except Peter, and James, and John the brother of James*: The specially favoured triumvirate,—specially favoured, no doubt, because of some special moral susceptibility in relation to the moral influence of the Saviour. The nearer they came to their Lord, and the longer they abode with him, the more did they open up to the inflow of his spirit. Meyer thinks that there is a small contradiction between the representations of Mark and Luke. Mark, he says, represents the other followers of our Lord as kept back by him *before* he had entered into the house, while Luke (viii, 51) represents them as kept back *after*. There is, however, nothing of the nature of contradiction. There is merely, on the part of Mark, an artless proleptic statement of the fact that only the three favoured disciples were allowed to accompany him, (viz. into the chamber of the maiden). And then he resumes—but still in an artless manner—the narrative of the events in their order. Some considerable portion of the general crowd might enter into the open court of the house. (See Luke viii, 51.) But only the triumvirate would be allowed to enter *the family apartment of the house.*

VER. 38. *And he cometh*:–Or rather, *And they come.* Such is the reading of ℵABCDFΔ, l, 33, and of the Vulgate, Peshito-Syriac, and Coptic versions. It is approved of by Mill (*Prol.* p. cxxix), and received into the text by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford. *They*, that is, Christ and the company in general.——*To*—or rather *into*—*the house of the ruler of the synagogue*:–

[x] them that wept and wailed greatly. 39 And when [y] he was come in, he saith unto them, Why make ye this ado, and weep? The damsel is not dead, but [y] sleepeth.

[x] Jer. 9. 17.

[y] John 11. 11.

---

That is, they enter through the gateway, and under the overarching building, into the open court of the house.———*And he beholds an uproar* (θεωρεῖ θόρυβον) *and people weeping aloud and wailing greatly*:–The scene represented struck upon two of the outer senses,—that of hearing and that of seeing. But the Evangelist gives prominence to that particular sense, which is our chief medium of observation,–seeing. Our Saviour *beholds an excited company of people making 'an uproar,' and, prominent in that company, persons busily engaged in 'weeping aloud,' or 'crying,' and 'wailing.'* The word rendered *tumult* in our Authorized Version, after the example of the Vulgate, is translated *uproar* in Matt. xxvi, 5; Mark xiv, 2. Compare Acts xvii, 5. Wycliffe renders it here *noyse*, Tyndale very inappropriately *wondrynge*, and Coverdale as unsuccessfully *busynesse*. It usually denoted *the confused noise of an excited public assembly*. The noise, on the present occasion, was chiefly that of wailing, and would be raised by the females of the establishment and their neighbours. "There are," says Dr. W. M. Thomson, "in every city, and community, "women exceedingly cunning in this business. They are always sent for, and "kept in readiness. When a fresh company of sympathizers comes in, these "women 'make haste' to take up a wailing, that the newly come may the "more easily unite their tears with the mourners." (*The Land and the Book*, p. 103.) The same artificiality and business-like way of mourning and crying was, and still is, common in Greece. Tournefort says in reference to the island of Candia, "the wife of one of the principal men in the city, over against whose "house we lodged, expired two days after our arrival. Scarce had she given "up the ghost, before we heard extraordinary cries, which made us inquire "what was the matter. They told us, that, according to the ancient Greek "custom, the public weepers were doing their duty over the body of the de-"ceased. These women," he adds, "really earn their money hard, and "Horace (*De Art. Po.*) had good reason to say that they give themselves more "plague and uneasiness, than those who mourn naturally." (*Voyage into the Levant*, vol. i, p. 99). This mourning *to order*, and *according to an approved pattern*, prevails still in many other places, even among those who do not literally "*sell* their sorrow." Dr. Clarke found it in Russia. In describing a funeral at Nikitskoy he employs a word, which admirably corresponds to the term employed by the Evangelist, (ἀλαλάζοντας, using the ἀλαλή),—"The women kept "up a kind of musical *ululation*, howling their loud lamentations in strains truly "dolorous." (*Travels*, vol. i, p. 251.)

Ver. 39. *And when he was come in, he says to them, Why make ye this ado, and weep?*–The verb rendered *make ye this ado* is cognate to the noun employed in the preceding verse,—*why make ye this uproar?*———*The child did not die, but sleepeth*:–Our Saviour occupied a peculiar, and peculiarly elevated, standpoint when he said *The child did not die*. He had not yet seen the child with his human eyes, and he could not therefore speak from human observation. He knew that the mourners were aware that this was the case. Neither did he mean to depreciate the gracious miracle which he was about to work, by alleging that

40 And they laughed him to scorn. But when he had put them all out, he taketh the father and the mother of the damsel, and them that were with him, and entereth in where the damsel was lying. 41 And he took the damsel by the

---

the case was by no means so desperate as they imagined. He was looking at the case from a lofty point of view. His idea is this,—*The child's terrestrial course is not terminated. It is not true that the child has done with life on earth. She has subsided, indeed, into unconsciousness toward things outward and terrene; but, in virtue of my will, it is only for a little. The child is therefore, as it were, but asleep.* (See John xi, 11.) The word for *child* is a diminutive in the original, (παιδίον). Wycliffe and the Rheims render it, with great simplicity, *wenche;* Tyndale, *mayden;* Coverdale, *mayde;* Cranmer's Bible, *damosell.*

Ver. 40. *And they laughed him to scorn*: They *derided him*, (the Rheims). They did not understand what he meant, when he said *The child is not dead.* They thought that he was meaning to deny the actual fact of her manifest decease. They would not, and did not, take time to ascend to that higher standpoint of observation, to which they had been invited by the lofty and solemn and eminently self-possessed bearing of the Saviour. They hurriedly prejudged and mis-judged his representation.——*But he, when he had thrust them all out*: Most probably by his mere word of command. There would be an authority displayed, which would make them cower and crowd out; for, no doubt, when our Saviour chose, there would be a majesty of manner in his bearing which would be ineffable and irresistible. Compare John xviii, 5, 6. But why did he *thrust them out?* He was not needing, on the one hand, to choose a very public theatre of representation. He was already inconvenienced by excess of publicity. (See chap. iii, 20; iv, 1, 35.) He might have been, and most probably would have been, annoyed on the spot, and harrassed, and oppressed, by a sudden and yet only superficial revulsion of feeling on the part of the excited crowd. And then, on the other hand, there are some solemnities to which privacy and domestic quiet are peculiarly appropriate, and which would be spoiled by din and tumult and uproar, even when springing from a spirit of admiration and joy.——*He taketh with himself the father of the child, and the mother, and those who were with him*: That is, the three disciples formerly specified. The others might probably be left in the street amid the crowd, while the Saviour was working his way into the court, and thence into the apartment where the mother with her companions would be found. Ferdinand C. Baur, by a strange oblivion of memory, says that "the three disciples also" are here represented as thrust out, *(Er trieb sie alle hinaus, also auch jene drei Jünger.—Markus,* p. 38.) They are, however, expressly excepted in the words before us.——*And entereth in where the child was*:—In some inner apartment. The word *lying* comes after *was* in the Received Text. But it is omitted by Griesbach, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, on the authority of ℵBDLΔ, and the Coptic and Æthiopic versions, as well as of some of the most important manuscripts of the old Italic version. It might have been very naturally and innocently supplied in the course of transcription.

Ver. 41. *And having taken hold of the hand of the child*:—thus visibly connecting himself with her,—for the sake, as we may suppose, of the witnesses;

hand, and said unto her, Talitha cumi, which is, being interpreted, Damsel, I say unto thee, [z]arise. 42 And straightway the damsel arose, and walked; for she was *of the age* of twelve years. And they were astonished with a great astonishment. 43 And he [a]charged them

[z] Acts 9. 40.

[a] Mark 3. 12.

---

at least for their sake principally.———*He says to her, 'Talitha cumi,' which is, being interpreted, Damsel, I say unto thee, arise*: There is nothing that precisely and literally corresponds, in the Aramaic expression *Talitha cumi*, to the words *I say unto thee*. But every imperative is *the saying of some one*: and hence, when the Saviour said '*cumi*,' his idea, when fully unfolded, was exactly, *I say unto thee, Arise*. The full unfolding might, with indifference, be either given, as in Mark, or withheld as in Luke (viii, 54). It is Mark alone who preserves the native Aramaic form of the Saviour's command. The words would likely be just such as the little girl had been accustomed to hear and to employ. And there was a beautiful propriety in our Lord addressing her returning and re-animating spirit in her natural mother-tongue. '*Tali*' was a *boy*, '*Talitha*' a *girl*. (See *Buxtorf's Lex. Talm.* p. 875, and *Lightfoot* in loc.) '*Cumi*,' or '*Cum*' as it is in some of the oldest manuscripts (ℵBCLM, 1, 33), is the common Hebrew word for *arise*. Here the idea is, as it were, *arise out of sleep, wake up, rouse thyself up internally and thence arise externally*. The word is translated *awake* in Matt. viii, 25; Rom. xiii, 11; Eph. v, 14. Compare Matt. ii, 13; viii, 26; xxvii, 52; Mark, iv, 27.

Ver. 42. *And immediately the damsel arose*:–It is a different word that is rendered *damsel* here, and in the last clause of the preceding verse, from that which is employed in verses 39, 40, and the first clause of the 41st verse. It properly means *damsel* or *damsel*, while the other means *child* or *little child*. The word *arose* too has no connection with the verb which is rendered *arise* in the preceding verse. It *strictly* means *arose*, (ἀνέστη).———*And walks about; for she was twelve years old*:–This last clause is added, as Euthymius Zigabenus properly remarks, because in the preceding part of the narrative the damsel is called *a little child*, (παιδίον). The Evangelist, as it were, says,—*In one respect, indeed, she was but a little child, the little darling of her father.* (See verse 23.) *But at the same time she was not so little as to be incapable of walking about.* ———*And they were astonished with a great astonishment*:–The important manuscripts ℵBCLΔ, and 33–"the queen of the cursives," add Mark's favourite *immediately* to the verb *were astonished,—and they were immediately astonished*. Tischendorf and Alford have introduced it into the Text. It is found too in the Coptic and Æthiopic versions, and it is scarcely likely that it would be intruded by transcribers. It seems rather to stand awkwardly in the way as a superfluity. It is probably, therefore, genuine. Instead of the repetitious expression *they were astonished with a great astonishment*, Tyndale, followed by Coverdale, has the more idiomatic phrase, *they were astonished out of measure.*—*They*:–The outstanding reference is doubtless to the father and mother of the child, (see next verse), though of course there is no need for shutting out of view the other witnesses of the miracle.

Ver. 43. *And he charged them straitly*:–Or, *he enjoined them much. Them*, the parents of the child. The verb rendered *charged* or *enjoined* (διεστείλατο)

straitly that no man should know it; and commanded that something should be given her to eat.

## CHAPTER VI.

*Jesus goes to Nazareth, his "fatherland," and preaches, but is received with suspicion by his townsmen,* 1—6. *He "itinerates,"* 6. *He sends out his twelve disciples on their first "apostolic" tour,* 7—13. *Herod the tetrarch hears*

---

literally means, *he gave a decision (in his own right).* It was a case in which he had liberty to decide for either alternative.——*That no man should know it*:—Literally, *in order that no one should know this.* His multiplied injunctions were laid upon them, with the aim in view, that *no one should know what had been done.* The expression *no one* is of course to be understood according to the nature of the case. The Saviour knew that there was outside the house a surging crowd of followers, loosely or more closely attached to his person, from whom the fact of the miracle could not be long concealed. He knew too that when once they got hold of the fact, they would be sure to blaze it abroad. (See Matt. ix, 26.) But he wished that the parents of the child should not lay themselves out to trumpet abroad what had been done. *He desired that as far as possible no one should know.* Popular enthusiasm was already rushing on at tornado speed, and with tornado pressure. It was, at the same time, but superficially intelligent; and it had therefore but little need, at that stage of its development, to be fed and fanned and still farther inflamed. ——*And commanded that something should be given her to eat*:—The expression *commanded* is too strong. The verb simply means *he spoke* or *said;* and this latter term—the word's common translation—is the one that is given here by Coverdale. He *said to the parents* that something should be given to the child to eat. It is an artless and beautifully homely incident. We need not suppose that the Saviour had exclusively in view the confirmation of the fact of the little maiden's resuscitation, as an actual fact, to be distinguished from a mere illusory appearance. This is the idea that Euthymius Zigabenus, Petter, and many others take. Neither need we suppose that he simply meant to prove to the parents her complete convalescence. There is no need for regarding our Saviour as acting for ever in the rigid character of a mere *doctrinaire.* He was not always bent on giving proofs and demonstrations. He was a loving man, genial in his feelings, full of human sympathies, fond of young folks. He would enter at once into the circle of the little damsel's self-consciousness, and understand how sweet to her young fresh appetite, after the long abstinence to which she had been subjected in her illness, would be "something to eat." Even the child's mother was not so motherly as Jesus.

## CHAPTER VI.

VERSES 1—6. This paragraph has its parallel in Matt. xiii, 53—58. There are also interesting points of correspondence in Luke iv, 16—30, which it may

*of him, and suspects that he is John the Baptist, risen from the dead,* 14—16. *Why it was that Herod had this suspicion: the tragedy of John the Baptist's death,* 17—29. *The twelve apostles return from their tour, and the Saviour takes them to the east side of the lake for rest,* 30—32. *They were seen departing, however, and a crowd followed them by land,* 33. *Jesus had compassion on the multitude, and taught them, and fed them in the desert, though they were five thousand in number: he fed them on five loaves and two fishes,* 34—44. *When he had sent off his disciples by boat, and dismissed the multitude, he retired to pray; and then, early in the morning, he walked to his disciples on the sea,* 45—52. *When they reached the land, crowds collected around him, and multitudes of sick people were healed,* 53—56.

AND he went out from thence, and [a]came into his own country; and his disciples follow him.

[a] Mat. 13. 54. Luke 4. 16.

---

be instructive to note. We do not need, however, to come to a very positive conclusion regarding the relationship of the two paragraphs.

VER. 1. *And he went out*:—Or *departed*, as the word is frequently rendered. See Matt. ix, 31; x, 14; xxviii, 8; Mark vii, 31; ix, 30; Luke ix, 6; Acts xi, 25; xiv, 20, &c. Tyndale, Coverdale, and the Geneva, have *departed* in the passage before us.———*Thence*:—Saunier (*Quellen*, p. 86), Fritzsche, and Meyer insist on it that the reference is to *the house of Jairus*. But arbitrarily. The house of Jairus was not a prominent object in the mind of the Evangelist, while penning the immediately preceding narratives. The prominent object was rather the district of country in which the house was situated. The Saviour had taken refuge on the eastern side of the sea of Tiberias. But he could not find rest there. He had to return to the western side, where Capernaum was situated. And there he was pressed, hemmed in, and harassed, by accumulating crowds. This being the case, the Evangelist says, *And he departed thence*, that is, *And he departed out of that district of country*. See next clause. ———*And comes*:—The Received Text has the past tense, *came*, and Lachmann abides by it. But Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford have the present *comes*. It is supported by the manuscripts ℵBCLΔ. The reader is thus taken back into the *presence* of our Lord, and sees him on his journey.———*Into his own country*:—Literally, *into his 'fatherland.'* The reference of the word, however, is not to the large district of country occupied by a nation or nationality, but to the small locality where the paternal home was situated. It is the district of Nazareth that is referred to,—a district of quiet and seclusion as compared with the densely crowded district of Capernaum. Nazareth, says Dr. Clarke, is "situate upon the side of a barren rocky elevation, facing the east, and commanding a long valley." (*Travels*, vol. iv, p. 164.) "No traveller," says Dr. Porter, "should miss the view from the top of the hill behind the town. It is the richest, and perhaps also the most extensive, one gets in all Palestine." (*Syria*, p. 346.) The town would be easily reached by our Lord in the course

2 And [b]when the sabbath day was come, he began to teach in the synagogue: and many hearing *him* were astonished, saying, From [c]whence hath this

[b] Mark 1. 21. 2 Ki. 4. 22, 23.
[c] Mark 3. 22.

---

of a day's journey.———*And his disciples follow him*:–The reference is doubtless to *the twelve*. But it is not meant that they *follow* him on a subsequent day. *They accompany him in the capacity of followers.* When the group was in motion, the Lord, as a general rule, would take a slight precedence and lead the way.

VER. 2. *And when Sabbath was come, he began to teach in the synagogue*:–"*The* synagogue," for most probably there would be only one in so small a place. But in all the Jewish synagogues there was a fine freedom of speech allowed; and there would be no objection, therefore, to one like Jesus, who had already achieved for himself a name as a popular and somewhat remarkable Rabbi, addressing the assembled congregation. The Evangelist says "*he began* to teach." We are thus taken back, in imagination, to the commencement of the address, and thence allowed or left to go forward with it, and take note of interruptions, if there should be any.———*And many, hearing, were struck with amazement*:–Such was the effect, even before the conclusion of the address. Note the participle *hearing*. The idea is not, as Principal Campbell and Edgar Taylor, as well as Piscator and Felbinger and many others, give it, in their respective versions, *and many who heard him*. There was not, on the Evangelist's part, any intention of discriminating two classes of auditors, one of which at least was numerous. Rodolphus Dickinson hits the idea in his free translation,—*the numerous hearers*. The congregation was numerous, and, *while hearing*, they were struck with amazement. Norton in his translation brings out the idea exactly, *and many heard him and were struck with astonishment*. In the Vatican manuscript (B) the article is inserted before the adjective, *the many, the multitude*. Tischendorf has received this peculiar reading into the text; but on too slender authority. Michelsen, however, approves of the reading, but supposes that it was foisted into the text by the Deutero-Mark! (*Het Ev. van Markus*, p. 102.)———*Saying*:–In the course, namely, of our Saviour's address. See verse 4. Hence the propriety of the preceding expression "*began* to teach." He had not proceeded far ere he was interrupted. There was less of decorous repression of remark and criticism, in a Jewish auditory, than in a British congregation.———*Whence hath this man these things*:–Very literally, *Whence to this (man) these things?* The *things*, namely, that he was *saying*. As the "winged words" left, in uninterrupted succession, the Saviour's lips, and alighted on their ears, the simple people marvelled at his facility and power of utterance, and at the weighty character of the thoughts that were conveyed by the utterances. Such phenomena of oratory are always captivating to the masses; and, when the orator is known to have had none of the advantages of school-learning, the captivation gets transformed into amazement. But amazement may either be questioning or unquestioning. In the case of the Nazarenes it was questioning, and superstition brought the questions to the birth. *Whence hath this man these things? Has he got them in a lawful way? Is there not something suspicious, something that looks suspiciously supernatural, in his acquisition of such a re-*

*man* these things? and what wisdom *is* this which is given unto him, that even such mighty works are wrought by his hands? 3 Is not this the carpenter, the son

---

*markable accomplishment?*———*And, What is the wisdom that has been given to him?*–It is probable that the introductory *and* is not part of the reported criticisms, but the Evangelist's own link of connection, by means of which he adds one reported criticism to another, *Whence has this man these things? and, What is the wisdom that has been given to him?* This interpretation of the *and* as introducing a second and separate criticism is confirmed by the reading of Tregelles, Tischendorf (8th edition), Alford,—"What is the wisdom that has been given *to this (man)?*" This repeated demonstrative, *to this (man)*, is in the texts of ℵBCLΔ. It is the more difficult reading, and ought to be accepted. But if so, it proves that the query is detached and separate from the query of the preceding clause. Tischendorf and Meyer run the two queries into one,—unhappily.—When the people ask, *What is the wisdom that has been given to this man?* they were looking at *wisdom* rather on its merely intellectual, than on its more important moral, side. They admitted the existence of great intellectual and rhetorical superiority; but they stood in doubt in reference to the origin of such superiority? Was it from above or from beneath?———*And such mighty works are brought to pass through his hands!*–Such is the right reading, (καὶ δυνάμεις τοιαῦται κ.τ.λ.). It is supported by AC²EFGHMSUV, 1, 69, and given in the texts of Tischendorf and Alford. The observation is thus an appendage to the two preceding questions. The people refer, not to the wonders of works which they had seen, but to the wonders of works of which they had heard. Such wonderful works seemed to them to be unaccountable on any hypothesis that would leave the reputation of the worker intact. *What are we to make of him? Whence his wonderful words? What is this wisdom, which somehow or other he has got hold of? Is it right? And then too such wonderful works are brought to pass! They are not easily accounted for. But they do come to pass 'through' his hands! Aye, 'through.' But who is it that is behind?* Luther makes them say, *Surely he will have to do with the devil, (Er wird gewiss mit dem Teufel zu thun haben).* The whole expression is rather an exclamation than an interrogation, and so Meyer has given it in his translation of 1829; though he afterwards changed his view. In the Received Text there is a *that* (ὅτι) before the expression,—*that even such wonders are brought to pass through his hands.* It is manifestly spurious, and is omitted even by Bengel, Griesbach, Matthaei, Scholz. It was condemned of old by Mill. It is wanting even in the editions of Erasmus; as also in the first and second editions—the *O mirificam*—of Robert Stephens. It was, however, introduced into his folio of 1550, retained in the 1551 edition, and thence copied into all Beza's editions, and thus carried down into our Authorized Version, and the Elzevirs. Candy, in his edition, has given a reading for which there is *no* authority at all, (αἱ καὶ δυνάμεις).

VER. 3. *Is not this the carpenter?*–The word *carpenter* was given, as an alternative translation, by Wycliffe, and has descended into all the succeeding English versions. Wycliffe's primary translation was *smith*,—the word that was used in the Anglo-Saxon version. It had in Anglo-Saxon a generic mean-

of Mary, the brother of James, and Joses, and of Juda,

---

ing, equivalent to *artificer*. A worker in iron was called in Anglo-Saxon *iren-smith*. A *smith* is one who *smites*. A *carpenter* is one who makes *cars*. The word *carpenter*, therefore, must be a much later coinage than the word *smith*. The original Greek term (τέκτων) means primarily a *producer*. The word *wright* very nearly corresponds to it, as being closely connected with *wrought* or *worked*. It just means *worker*, and occurs in Anglo-Saxon in the two forms, *wrhta* and *wyrhta*.—This is the only passage in which it is stated that our Lord worked at a handicraft. It is a different expression that is found in Matthew xiii, 55, *Is not this the carpenter's son?* There is no contradiction, however, between the two representations. Both might be coincidently employed, and no doubt were, when the Nazarenes were freely and frettingly canvassing the merits of their wonderful townsman. Our Lord would not be trained to idleness. It was contrary to Jewish habits, and to the teaching of the best Jewish rabbis. (See *Lightfoot*, in loc.) It would have been inconsistent, moreover, with the principles of true civilization, and with the ideal of normal human development. It is no evidence of high civilization, either to lay an arrest on full physical development on the one hand, or, on the other, to encourage only those modes of muscular and nervous activity which are dissociated from useful working and manufacturing skill. While overmuch manual labour depresses both body and mind; handiwork in moderation is an inestimable blessing to men, physically, morally, intellectually, socially. Society will never be right until all classes be industrious and industrial. The higher orders must return to take part in the employments of the lower. The lower must rise up to take part in the enjoyments of the higher. Justin Martyr mentions, in his *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew* (§. 88), that the Saviour manufactured "ploughs and yokes,"—thus "teaching the symbols of righteousness, and the duty of an active life." (ἄροτρα καὶ ζυγά· διὰ τούτων καὶ τὰ τῆς δικαιοσύνης σύμβολα ἐδίδασκεν, καὶ ἀεργὴ(?)βίον.) We know not whether Justin preserves in this "specific" remark a separate tradition, or merely gives an illustrative and imaginative explanation of the "generic" expression before us. In the apocryphal *Gospel of the Infancy* (chap. xxxviii) Jesus is represented as assisting his reputed father Joseph, while working at his trade. But the assistance is always given in a miraculous manner. "Neither was there ever any need," it is added, "for him to do anything with his own hand." It is evident that the author of this Apocryphal Gospel did not understand the true dignity of manual work. Neither did Celsus, who insolently and ignorantly cast it in the teeth of Christians that Christ worked with his own hands. (Origen, *Cont. Cels.* vi, 4,3.)———*The son of Mary*: We would not infer, from the specification of *Mary*, as F. C. Baur (*Markus Evang.* p. 138) and Hilgenfeld (*Evangelien*, p. 135) do, that the Evangelist was taking care to use no expression, that might suggest that our Lord was the real or natural son of Joseph. We are as little to infer, with Köstlin (*Ursprung.* p. 323), that while Mark assumed that our Lord was really the natural son of Joseph, he yet wished, for "irenic" purposes within the divided church, to give no certain sound on the subject. We would simply infer that Joseph was deceased, and had been so for such a considerable length of time, that our Lord's filial relationship to the widowed Mary

and Simon? and are not his sisters here with us? And they were [d] offended at him. 4 But Jesus said unto

[d] Mat. 11. 6.

stood out, overshadowingly, and almost exclusively, to public view. It is true that in the parallel passage of Matt. xiii, 55, Joseph is referred to. But it is in the way of bringing into view the humble nature of the trade, on which the family had depended,—*Is not this the carpenter's son?* The youngest of the criticizing Nazarenes knew that the trade had been hereditary in the family, and that therefore our Lord had never been in circumstances to obtain any high rabbinical training. It is entirely and wantonly arbitrary in Holtzmann (*Synop. Evang.* p. 82) and Michelsen (*Het. Evang. van Markus*, p. 102), to conjecture that in the text of the Proto-Mark the query ran thus—*Is not this the carpenter, the son of Joseph?* and that, from this text of the Proto-Mark, Matthew formed, on his part, his condensation, while the Deutero-Mark, on his part, and for his own peculiar purposes, formed his dogmatic variation. Such licentiousness of conjecture is wild on the one hand, and mere "rubbish" on the other.———*And brother of James, and Joses, and Judas, and Simon*:–In what sense *brother*, see on chap. iii, 18, 31,—half-brother, but not uterine. James, in short, and the three brothers would be the sons of Joseph by a previous marriage. In the correct text there is an *and*, but no *article*, before the word *brother*. Such is the reading of Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford. Instead of *Joses*, the Sinaitic manuscript (ℵ) reads *Joseph*, as so many manuscripts do in Matt. xiii, 55. It was the comparative uncommonness of the name *Joses* that gave occasion to the variation. (See *Comment. on Matt.* in loc.) ———*And are not his sisters here with us?*–Their names are not specified, in accordance with the secondary place which was assigned to females in Semitic society.———*And they were offended at him*:–Or rather *in him*. The word rendered *offended* is *scandalized* in the original. It is a very graphic word, but incapable of adequate translation. It presents to view a complex picture. Christ was to his kinsmen and townsmen like a *scandal*, or catch-stick, in a trap. (See on chap. iv, 17.) They did not see what he was. They hence heedlessly ran up against him, and struck on him,—to their own utter ensnarement. They were spiritually caught. They became fixed in a position in which it was most undesirable to be fixed. They were spiritually hurt, and in great danger of being spiritually destroyed. Such are the chief elements of the picture. The actual outcome of the whole complex representation may be given thus,—*They spiritually stumbled on Jesus.—To their loss they did not accept him for what he really was.—They rejected him as the Lord High Commissioner of Heaven.—They came into collision with him, and were ensnared, by suspecting that his indisputable superiority to ordinary men, in word and work, was owing to some other kind of influence than what was right and from above.*

VER. 4. *But*:–Or rather, *And* (καί). Such is the reading of ℵBCDLΔ, and the Vulgate, Syriac-Peshito, and Coptic versions.———*Jesus said unto them, A prophet is not without honour, but in his own country, and among his own kin, and in his own house*:–He specifies three concentric circles of persons, to whom every prophet is nearly related. There is (1) the circle of his *little fatherland*, or *district of country*, or township. There is no wider reference in the Saviour's expression. Within this outer circle there is (2) the circle of his *relatives* or

them, [e] A prophet is not without honour, but in his own country, and among his own kin, and in his own house. 5 And he [f] could there do no mighty

[e] Luke 4. 24. John 4. 44.
[f] Gen. 19. 22. Tit. 1. 2. Heb. 6. 18. Mar. 9. 23.

"*kin.*" Then there is (3) the circle of his *nearest relatives*,—the *family to which he belongs*. In each of these circles there is in general but little readiness to recognize native or nascent superiority. The principles of self-satisfaction, self-confidence, self-complacency, come in to lay a presumptive interdict upon any *adjoining self* rising up in eminence above the *my-self*. The temporary advantage of age, and thus of more protracted experience, asserts to itself for a season a sort of counter-superiority. And the mere fact of proximity makes it easy to open the door for the influence of envy,—an ignoble vice that takes effect chiefly in reference to those on whom one can actually look, *(invidia, in-video)*. In the long run, indeed, real superiority,—if time be granted it,—will vindicate for itself its own proper place in the midst of all its concentric circles. But in general this will be only after victories achieved abroad have made it impossible for the people at home to remain in doubt. (Hofmeister quotes the proverb, "*quod rarum, carum.*") Our Saviour, in uttering his apophthegm uses, representatively, the word *prophet*. He might have employed a more generic term, that would have embraced other examples of superiority. But the specification served his purpose. And it was at the same time broad enough to bring into view one of the great outstanding features of his own unique relationship to men. He had a commission, amid other behests, to *speak to them for God*. He was emphatically "the *Word of* God," and thus the prophet of prophets. The term *prophet* has no particular reference to *prediction*. The *pro* has rather a local than a temporal import. The true prophet was one who spoke *fore* God, and therefore *from* God, and thus *for* God. It is entirely arbitrary in Schenkel, to say that our Lord "still called "himself *a prophet*, because he had not yet attained the conviction that he "was, in a new and higher meaning of the word, the fulfiller of the yet in-"complete Messianic promise of the Old Testament." *(Charakterbild*, x, 4.) Our Saviour was only laying down a generic principle for a specific purpose; and he left his auditors, as it is so often wise to do, to make the specific application.

VER. 5. *And he was not able to do there any mighty work*:—Instead of *he was not able*, Rodolphus Dickinson has, *he was unwilling;*—an unhappy freedom. It occurs, however, in some of the old Italic versions, that existed before Jerome's Vulgate, *(noluit)*. Kuinol merges altogether the idea both of ability and of will, and explains the phrase thus, "*he was not able to do, that is, he did not do;*"—an intolerable strain upon the evangelist's phraseology. The Saviour was really *shut up* to act as he did, and thus to withhold, almost altogether, from the Nazarenes, miraculous manifestations;—not because of any weakness on his part, but because of utter moral insusceptibility on theirs. His *power* never acted absolutely, or simply by itself, like mere blind force. It was invariably linked, right and left, with the highest wisdom, which, when regarded in its highest acceptation, is always coincident with the clearest intelligence on the one hand, and the purest love on the other. The Saviour's

work, save that he laid his hands upon a few sick folk, and healed *them*. 6 And he [g]marvelled because of their unbelief.

[h]And he went round about the villages, teaching.

[g] Isai. 59. 16. Jer. 2. 12.
[h] Mat. 9. 35. Luke 13. 22. Acts 10. 38.

---

power, as thus conditioned and regulated, *could not* go forth in the performance of mighty works among a people, who would only have abused the gracious miracles to rivet their conviction that it was by some unlawful and demonic influence that he was actuated. Euthymius Zigabenus explains the inability thus, *he did not deem it admissible* (ἐνδεχόμενον). "The door," says Calvin, "was, so to speak, shut upon the Saviour by the people's impiety."———*Save that he laid his hands on a few sick folk, and healed them*:—Wakefield's version is free, but admirable, *beyond healing a few sick people by laying his hands upon them*. Such works, performed in all likelihood upon "hidden ones," would be inconspicuous, and therefore "admissible" in the circumstances. They would be, however, intensely gratifying to the Saviour's benevolence.

VER. 6. *And he marvelled because of their unbelief*:—It is not said, as several critics have remarked, that *he marvelled 'at' their unbelief*. The preposition *because of* (διά) brings into view, not the *object* of the astonishment, but the *cause* or *occasion* of it. Logically, however, though not phraseologically, the *object* of the astonishment, and the *cause* or *occasion* of it, were identical. The unbelief of the Nazarenes *was* a wonder to our Lord. The wonder was "real," says Cardinal Cajetan,—being "caused" by the Saviour's "experimental inacquaintance" with such an unreasonable state of mind. It was "real" on another account. Unbelief in such circumstances, as those of the Nazarenes, was actually a most remarkable thing. It had a *cause* indeed. It had *occasions*. But it had *no reason* for its existence. Far less had it *a sufficient reason*. It was, that is to say, utterly *unreasonable*. It should not have been. It was an utter anomaly. So is all sin. (See Jer. ii, 12.) It is an exceedingly strange phenomenon in the universe of God, and may well be wondered at. If wonder, indeed, were always *the daughter of ignorance*, one might wonder at Christ's wonder. Schleusner and Kuinöl wondered, and rendered the word, not *wondered*, but *was angry*. Fritzsche too wondered, and, while too precise a scholar to admit that the word could mean *was angry*, he proposed that we should correct the text, and read it thus, *and, because of their unbelief, they wondered* (viz., at Jesus). But one may most reasonably wonder at such feats and freaks of exegesis. *There is nothing really wonderful in Christ's wonder*. While it is the case that there is a vulgar wonder, which is the daughter of ignorance, and dies when knowledge is attained; it is also the case that there is another wonder, of noble origin,—the daughter of knowledge. This wonder dwells in the loftiest minds, and is immortal.

*And he went round about the villages teaching*:—That is, *He went round the villages in circuit, teaching*, or, *He went round the villages, taking a circuit, and taught*. This does not mean that he visited the circle of villages *round about Nazareth*. The evangelist was taking, topographically, a much wider view. He means that Jesus, instead of tarrying at Nazareth, and thus confining his bootless labours to an unreceptive people, left that place, and extended his personal ministrations to

7 And he called *unto him* [1]the twelve, and began [1] Mark 3. 13. Mat. 10. 1. Luke 9. 1.
to send them forth by two and two; and gave them
power over unclean spirits; 8 and commanded them

---

the entire circle of the Galilean villages,—retaining, no doubt, his headquarters in the central parts about Capernaum. This being the obvious meaning of the evangelist, it is to be regretted that Robert Stephens, the verse-maker, did not add the preceding clause of the verse to the 5th, and leave this clause to form, by itself, the 6th verse. Theophylact saw better into the connection, and commenced a new paragraph with this clause. So did Luther, and also Tyndale and Coverdale. So too, notwithstanding the awkwardness of rupturing a verse, do Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford. These editors commence a new line with this second clause of the verse. So do Mace, Principal Campbell, Rodolphus Dickinson, Rilliet, Young.———From this clause to verse 13 inclusive is a distinct paragraph. Compare, for parallel paragraphs, Luke ix, 1—6, in particular; and also Matt. x, 1—15.

VER. 7. *And he calls to him the twelve*:—Note the present tense *calls*. The Evangelist transports himself and his readers to the scene.———*And began to send them forth two by two*: He *began*. It is a favourite way of speaking with Mark, (see Scholten, *Het Oudste Evang.* p. 149), founded on a favourite way of conceiving. He liked to look at the beginnings of things. When a process or progression was implied, he felt inclined to set down his thoughts at the starting-places, and thence to look forward indefinitely and perhaps dimly toward the termini. (See chap. i, 45; v, 17, 20; vi, 2, 34, 55; viii, 32; x, 28, 41, 47; xi, 15; xiii, 5; xiv, 65, 69; xv, 18.) In the case before us there is no latent reference to the future mission of the apostles "to all the world." There is merely a certain graphic way of viewing the process of despatching the apostles. *Two by two*: That they might help and encourage one another, and take counsel together. Union is strength. It is remarkable that Mark alone mentions this pairing of the apostles on their first evangelistic tour. And yet, when enumerating the apostles in chapter iii, 16—19, he gives no indication of any order of pairing; whereas both Matthew and Luke, who do not mention that they were sent out in couples, actually introduce the coupling into their respective lists of the apostolate. (Matt. x, 2—4; Luke vi, 14—16.) It is one of those minute undesigned coincidences that establish the actual historical validity of the respective narratives.———*And he gave them authority over the unclean spirits*:—"*the* unclean spirits" that were then rampant in society, and that have ever been such formidable and cruel enemies to men. *Unclean*: Characterized by, and revelling in, moral impurity. Witness the disgusting obscenities, and other abominations, in the talk of some of those who are *beside themselves*, and therefore *not themselves*, but *more than themselves*, and hence mercifully shut up in asylums. Our Saviour gave his apostles *authority*. If it had failed them in the time of trial, and turned out to be a mere myth of their Master's imagination, how could they have retained their allegiance to him as the Lord? The fact that they retained it, and consecrated their lives to his service,—amid obloquy, persecution, and "deaths,"—is surely proof sufficient that they were not befooled.

VER. 8. *And he charged them that they should take nothing for their journey*:—

that they should take nothing for *their* journey, save a [i] staff only; no scrip, no bread, no [1] money in *their* [j] purse: 9 but *be* [k] shod with [l] sandals; and not put

[1] The word signifieth *a piece of brass money, in value somewhat less than a farthing,* Mat. 10. 9, but here it is taken in general for *money,* Luke 9. 3. [i] Mat. 10. 10. [k] Eph. 6. 15. [l] Acts 12. 8.

---

Literally, *for (the) road.* They would not require to carry with them any *viaticum.* Not requiring to carry it with them, they would not require to *take* it as they started, literally, to *take (it) up,* viz., that it might be carried. Their wants would be sufficiently supplied, as they went along.———*Except a staff only*:–Wetstein, by a temporary but singular lapse of thought, imagined that this expression means *except a single staff, one only for each pair of apostles.* But the word *only* is not an adjective here (note the gender), but an adverb. The Coptic and Anglo-Saxon translators, however, had committed the same oversight as Wetstein. In Matthew x, 10, the apostles were told *not to provide a staff.* (See *Comment.* in loc.) The emphasis there is on the *provide. Do not acquire for yourselves what at present you are not possessed of.* Here the idea is substantially the same, though taken from another side of the reality. *Go as you are, without making any provision whatsoever. If you have a staff at any rate, and are accustomed to use it, you need not throw it away; but do not add to it;—do not use it to suspend over your shoulders, for your future convenience, any bag or baggage. Take it by itself, and set out immediately. I shall be the Lord your Provider.*———*No bread, no wallet*:–Such is the order of the words in the manuscripts ℵBCLΔ, 33, and in the Coptic and Æthiopic versions, as also in the texts of Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford. The reverse order of the Received Text is the order of Luke ix, 3. In our Authorized English Version, and all its precursors,—Wycliffe, Purvey, Tyndale, Coverdale, the Geneva, the Rheims,—*scrip* is used. That word, however, has now become quite obsolete as meaning *wallet,* and, as derived from another root, has a totally different meaning on the Stock Exchange. The Gothic translation of the word is *matibalg,* or *meat-bag.*———*No brass in their purse*:–Or rather *no copper in their girdle*:–It is *copper* that is the metal that is got from the bowels of the earth. *Brass* is an artificial alloy, having in it a mixture of tin with the copper, and was unknown, as is supposed, to the Hebrews. The word is not used by the evangelist to denote any particular copper coin, but simply, though representatively, *copper money* in general. The underlying idea is *money in general.* Not even *coppers* would be needed, not to speak of *silver* and *gold.* (Comp. Matt. x, 9; Luke ix, 3.) The original *purse* consisted of the folds of the girdle, sash, or zone, ("*argentum in zonis habentes,*" Liv. xxxiii, 29). The evangelist's expression, very literally, is *into the girdle.* He was artlessly thinking of *putting* money '*into*' that natural repository. The same artlessness comes out strikingly in the two succeeding clauses.

VER. 9. *But be shod with sandals*:–Or, more simply and inartificially, *but having been shod with sandals.* The construction is broken. It is as if it had been said,—*I charge you to set out without bread, wallet, or money, but having got sandals tied on.* They were not, indeed, to have a change of shoes. (See Matt. x, 10.) That would not be needed for all the time that they would require to spend on their tour. But as they were to have a good deal of walk-

on two coats. 10 And he said unto them, [m] In what place soever ye enter into an house, there abide till ye depart from that place. 11 And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear you, when ye depart thence, [n] shake off the dust under your feet for a testimony

[m] Mat. 10. 11. Luke 9. 4.

[n] Acts 13. 51. Acts 18. 6. Neh. 5. 13.

---

ing hither and thither, and often over rough places, *they must have on sandals.* The original expression, very freely rendered in our version *be shod*, has reference to the strings by which the sandals—as covering only the soles of the feet—were tied on, (*ὑποδεδεμένους σανδάλια.*) I have often looked with interest, while in Syria, on the primitive contrivance. A piece of thick tough skin, shaped somewhat like the foot, but every way larger —so that an edging may be turned up, constitutes a common specimen of the sandal of the poor. The edging is perforated at a considerable number of points to admit of elaborate lacing by means of thongs. The word employed in Matt. x, 10, and there translated *shoes*, (*ὑποδήματα*), does not refer, as Piscinellus, Salmasius, Heumann, and others, have supposed, to a more artistic cover for the feet. It is a word cognate to the verb that is here employed, and simply denotes *the undertied thing*, that is, *the thing underneath the sole of the foot that is elaborately tied on.*———*And do not put on two coats*:–Or, *two tunics*, as Rilliet appropriately renders it. They were not to take any superfluity of dress, as if provision had to be made for a very lengthened tour. The *tunic* was the somewhat close-fitting garment that was worn next the skin. Children and very poor persons frequently wore nothing else.

Ver. 10. *And he said to them*: In addition to his other injunctions. It is a favourite phrase with Mark, when he introduces something *furthermore.*——— *Wheresoever ye may have entered into a house, there remain until ye shall have departed from that place*: They were not to cater, self-indulgently and restlessly, for the most agreeable quarters. When welcomed by any "worthy" individual to his home, they were to be contented with it, however humble it might be, while they continued in the locality. (Compare Luke x, 7.) All along their tour they were to maintain a spirit of restraint and self-denial, as regarded themselves, and, as regarded others, a tender regard to the benevolent feelings of the good.

Ver. 11. *And whatsoever place shall not receive you*: Or, more literally, *shall not have received you.* Our Saviour goes forward in thought to a time when the act of non-reception would be past. *Whatsoever place*, instead of *whosoever*, was no doubt the reading in the autograph of Mark, (*καὶ ὃς ἂν τόπος μὴ δέξηται ὑμᾶς*). It is preserved in the manuscripts ℵBLΔ, 69, as well as in the Coptic and Æthiopic versions, and the margin of the Philoxenian-Syriac. It is replaced in the text by Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford; and approved of by Meyer. It would never have been disturbed, had it not been for the artless *anacoluth* of the succeeding clause.———*Nor shall have listened to you*: In this clause the evangelist passes altogether, in thought, from the *place*, as a *place*, to its *living inhabitants.* And hence his verb *shall have listened*, unlike the preceding verb *shall have received*, is in the plural number, (*ἀκούσωσιν*). We cannot reproduce in English, without a circumlocution, the abrupt transition. ——— *When ye depart thence, shake off the soil that is under your feet*:–The soil,

against them. Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Sodom [2] and Gomorrha in the day of judgement, than for that city.

12 And they went out, and preached that men should [o] repent. 13 And they [p] cast out many devils, and

[2] Gr. *or.*

[o] Luke 24. 47. Acts 2. 38. Acts 3. 19. Acts 20. 21. Heb. 6. 1.

[p] Luke 10. 17.

---

that is to say, which is adhering to the soles of your sandals. What Mark, in his simple generic manner, calls *soil* or *earth* (χοῦς, not χοῦς as in the editions of Erasmus), Matthew and Luke, more specifically and elegantly, call *dust* (κονιορτός). Wycliffe translates it freely, *powdre.*———*For a testimony to them* :–a *testimony* that ye are constrained to regard them as unclean, somewhat as the heathen are. (See *Comment. on Matt.* x, 14.) Let them know that ye could not wish to take the least particle of their spirit along with you. It would be defiling.———In the *Received Text*, there follow the words, *verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrha, in the day of judgement, than for that city.* But the critical editors have, almost unanimously, thrown them out as an import from Matt. x, 15. Lachmann puts them within brackets. They are not found in the manuscripts ℵBCDLΔ, nor in the Vulgate and Armenian versions, and many copies of the Italic. Against such authority, says Griesbach, *the weight of six hundred, or of six thousand, Constantinopolitan manuscripts is nothing at all, (is 'nil.'—Com. Crit.* in loc.) Erasmus and Beza suspected the genuineness of the clause; and Mill condemned it, following Zacharias Chrysopolitanus. It is omitted in the editions of Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford,—rightly. But Matthæi and Fritzsche nevertheless, in consequence of their peculiar and erroneous standpoint in textual criticism, contend for it.

Ver. 12. *And they went out, and preached that men should repent* :–This is one-half of the brief unambitious narrative of the first apostolic tour of the apostles. The expression *that men should repent*, does not so much exhibit the subject-matter of the apostles' preaching, as the aim that actuated them. But that aim, nevertheless, would determine the subject-matter. And hence the subject-matter of the speaking, and the aim of the speakers, would be coincident. The expression in the original is literally, *in order that* (ἵνα) *men might repent*, or, as Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles read it, *in order that men 'may' repent*, (μετανοῶσιν). It was thus the apostles' great aim to induce men to turn, inwardly, and then outwardly, from the error of their ways. That they might succeed in this their aim, they addressed themselves to the *intelligence* (the νοῦς) of men, and thus sought to bring them to *a reconsideration of their ways.* (See chap. i, 4.) The term, says Petter, "which is translated *repent* is such a word as doth properly signify *to change one's mind*, or to become more wise than before."

Ver. 13. In this verse we have the other half of the Evangelist's Report of the first apostolic tour. *And they cast out many demons, and anointed with oil many invalids, and healed them* :–There is no reference here to what Roman Catholics call *the sacrament of extreme unction.* So even a-Lapide admits and contends. The reference is to *medicinal anointing,*—a favourite method of cure among the ancient Jews, and many other peoples. (See Isaiah i, 6, and

anointed with [q] oil many that were sick, and healed *them.* [q] Luke 10. 34. Jas. 5. 14.

14 [r] And king Herod heard *of him;* (for his name was spread abroad:) and he said, That John the [r] Mat. 14. 1. Luke 9. 7.

---

Luke x, 34.) Josephus mentions that Herod the Great, in one of his illnesses, was "immersed in a bath full of oil," and obtained a surprising recovery for a season. (*Antiq.* xvii, 6. 5.) Celsus, the famous Latin physician, in his great work *de Medicina*, makes frequent reference to the medicinal use of oil, in connection with medical friction, &c. (Lib. i, cap. 3, &c.) Such a simple hygienic application has perhaps been too much neglected amid the multitudinous recipes of the modern pharmacopeia. The apostles made use of it, we should suppose, representatively, as being the sheet-anchor of the ancient pharmacopeia; but, assuredly, they did not employ it in the way dreamed of by Paulus and Kuinöl,—the way of simply applying, by natural medical skill, a natural medicinal remedy. Neither, on the other hand, would it be merely in a symbolical way that they would apply it, as Beza and Petter contend. They would employ it, on a principle of intercorrespondency or harmony, as a fitting material and visible medium, through which the invisible and divine influence, which it was their prerogative to communicate, took effect. Not that we are to suppose that it was the only fitting medium. It was employed *representatively* only. There is no evidence that our Saviour ever himself used the same medium. He used *words* at times, and *touching* at other times. "He healed," as Michaelis remarks, "by a word, a command, a simple touch: his apostles, by ointment and medicines." (*Anmerkungen.* in loc.) But they healed miraculously nevertheless. As Lightfoot expresses it, "they used an ordinary medicine, and obtained an extraordinary and infallible effect." (*Heb. and Talm. Exer. on Matt.* vi, 17.)

VERS. 14—16. A little paragraph, giving occasion for the insertion of the larger one that immediately follows. It corresponds to Luke ix, 7—9, and Matt. xiv. 1, 2.

VER. 14. *And the king Herod heard*: The Cambridge Manuscript (D) and some few other authorities read reversely *Herod the king.* The evangelist does not tell what it was that he *heard.* His own mind was full of his great Subject, of Christ, and of his sayings and doings. He hence artlessly writes as if his readers could not but understand what he was referring to. The Syriac-Peshito version adds the words *concerning Jesus.* It is far too narrow a view to suppose, with Meyer, that the intended reference is to the contents of verses 12 and 13. The Herod spoken of, Herod Antipas, one of the sons of Herod the Great by Malthace the Samaritan, was not strictly and technically *king*, like his father. He was only *tetrarch;* and so he is named by both Matthew (xiv, 1) and Luke (ix, 7). But, as he was really sovereign in his own fraction of the old kingdom, the tetrarchy of Galilee and Perœa, he was popularly and by courtesy called *king.*———*For his name was spread abroad*: Or, as Coverdale gives it, *for his name was now known;* literally, *for his name was become manifest*, or, as it were, *conspicuous;* a parenthetical remark, accounting for the fact that even the tetrarch, though far removed from the circle of society in which Jesus was working, had heard of him.———*And he said, John the Baptist has been raised from the dead*:—That is, *from among the dead.* The

Baptist was risen from the dead, and therefore mighty works do shew forth themselves in him. 15 *Others said, That it is Elias. And others said, That it is a pro-

* Mat. 16. 14. Mark 8. 28.

---

report of Herod's remark is given, not in the indirect, but in the direct, form; and hence the introductory demonstrative *That*, found in the Authorized Version, should be omitted, in harmony with our English idiom. It is omitted both by Tyndale and Coverdale, and in the Geneva, but was introduced by the Rheims. The guilty monarch's conscience was haunted by ghastly reminiscences and weird forebodings. These, working in conjunction with a superstition which he found it impossible, notwithstanding his Epicureanism, to shake off, projected their own ghost-like shadows of things upon the wonderful personality of our Lord.——*And therefore mighty works do show forth themselves in him*:—Or rather, *and on this account the powers are operative in him*, (ἐνεργοῦσιν αἱ δυνάμεις ἐν αὐτῷ). This is a snatch of Herod's theology and philosophy. He knew that the Baptist had, in his natural lifetime, wrought no miracles. But he thought that, in consequence of his connection with the Unseen World, he had now become a prominent subject and agent of the occult forces of the universe. He knew not *what these forces were*. But he was sure *that they were*. He had too a wholesome dread of them, and was uneasy when the idea took possession of him that one of their terrestrial Centres of operation was in the resuscitated person of his old faithful Adviser, whom he had so unrighteously put out of the way. "*The* powers," generically considered. *The existing* powers. Wycliffe's translation of the clause is, *and therfore vertues worchen in hym*, that is, as the Rheims gives it, *worke in him*.

VER. 15. Round about the peculiar opinion of Herod regarding the wonderful Galilean Rabbi, other opinions were in circulation, and more or less ventilated. *Others said*:—Or rather, *But others said*. Almost all the good manuscripts insert the conjunction.——*It is Elias*:—Or *Eliah*. For he was expected to reappear on the earth, to prepare the way for the establishment of the kingdom of heaven. (See Mal. iv, 5.) It was assumed by those who mooted this opinion regarding the Galilean Rabbi, that he could not be the Messiah Himself. The Messiah was to be a great and glorious King, and would be found in some palace, surrounded with courtiers and generals and armies. ——*But others said, A prophet! Like one of the prophets!*—Such is the translation of the correct reading. A twofold form of the report is recorded. One was, *A prophet!* Another was, *Like one of the prophets!* Elias, too, was a prophet. But he stood apart on a peculiar pedestal, as "*the* forerunner," and as thus pre-eminently "*the* prophet." Some, who could not imagine that Jesus was so great a personage, yet supposed that he might very likely be *a prophet*, say perhaps Jeremiah (Matt. xvi, 14). Others, who could not go quite so far, yet admitted that he was *like one of the prophets*,—one of them come to life again. In the *Received Text* there is an *or* inserted between the two forms of the report. It is wanting, however, in almost all the important manuscripts, inclusive of ℵABC and 33—"the queen of the cursives," and in almost all the old versions, inclusive of the Vulgate and Syriac-Peshito. It is thrown out of the text by Bengel, Griesbach, Matthæi, Scholz, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford. Besides this spurious *or*, there is also in the *Received Text*,

phet, or as one of the prophets. 16 [t] But when Herod heard *thereof*, he said, It is John, whom I beheaded: he is risen from the dead.

[t] Mat. 14. 2.

17 For Herod himself had sent forth and laid hold upon John, and bound him in prison for Herodias' sake, his brother

---

the substantive verb, "*it is* a prophet;" but this too, though better supported than the disjunctive particle, was a transcriber's addition to Mark's own abrupt phraseology.

VER. 16. *But when Herod heard*: It is not said what. Meyer thinks that the reference is to the different opinions entertained regarding our Lord. Unlikely. It is more probable that the evangelist is simply reverting, resumptively, to what he had said in verse 14. He repeats the abrupt phrase which he there employed, and which would be still standing out to view in his memory.——*He said, It is he whom I beheaded, John; he is risen from the dead*: The construction is rugged in the original, but graphically exhibits such broken modes of phraseology as might be expected from one in Herod's position, speaking under the impulse of superstition and the sting of conscience. He turns the first part of his observation right round as it were,—*whom I beheaded, John, he is risen from the dead.* It is somewhat doubtful whether the words *from the dead* may not be a marginal addition. They are omitted by Tischendorf and Alford on the authority of ℵBLΔ and 33—"the queen of the cursives." They are also omitted in the Coptic version and the Harclean Syriac. Tregelles encloses them within brackets. It is of no moment whether they be retained or left out.

VERSES 17–29 constitute a long and intensely "sensational" paragraph. Its "sensationalism," however, is the quiet efflorescence of truth, not the noisy effervescence of fiction. It is "truth stranger than fiction:"—deeply instructive truth, moreover,—giving glimpses into scenes behind the curtain of court life, and revealing the hollowness of the pleasures that are founded on immorality. At the bottom of these pleasures there is an opening into an abyss of disappointment and woe. The paragraph is introduced into the narrative to account for Herod's notion regarding Jesus. It would, however, be gladly introduced by the evangelist, partly because of the intensely striking character of the facts narrated, and partly because of the opportunity which it afforded for giving information regarding John the Baptist, who stood in so intimate a relationship to our Lord. A corresponding paragraph is found in Matt. xiv, 3—12, but not in Luke. Compare, however, Luke iii, 19, 20.

VER. 17. *For Herod himself*:—This very Herod, whose opinion of Jesus has just been recorded.——*Had sent forth*: The verb is not in the pluperfect tense in the original, but in the aorist. He *sent out*, viz. at a former stage of things, when he had been irritated by the faithful remonstrances of the incorruptible preacher. ——*And arrested John, and bound him in prison*:—The idea is not, that John was bound when once he was got into prison, but that *he was bound when arrested, and then shut him up in prison.* Manacles would no doubt be put upon him, ere he was led off to prison. The language is constructed in a free and inartificial way.——*Because of Herodias, the wife of Philip his brother*:—Philip was the brother of Antipas by the same father,

Philip's wife: for he had married her. 18 For John had said unto Herod, [a]It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife. 19 Therefore Herodias had [3]a quarrel against him, and would have killed him;

[a] Lev. 18. 16. Lev. 20. 21.
[3] Or, *an inward grudge.*

---

Herod the Great, but not by the same mother. The mother of Antipas was Malthace the Samaritan. The mother of Philip was Mariamne the daughter of Simon the high priest. (*Joseph. Ant.* xviii, 5, 1, 4.) This Philip — to be distinguished, notwithstanding all the efforts of Volkmar (*Die Evang.* p. 367–8), from Philip the tetrarch of Trachonitis (see Patritius, *De Evangeliis*, vol. ii, p. 424–5) — lived privately at Rome, and had a daughter Salome by his wife Herodias. Herodias was herself a grand-daughter of Herod the Great, being the daughter of Aristobulus, who was Herod's son by Mariamne, the grand-daughter of Hyrcanus. Philip her husband, and Antipas her subsequent paramour, were thus her uncles! So incestuously tangled was the family web! Agrippa the Great was one of her three brothers.———*For he had married her*: Or, more literally, *for he married her*. It was a sadly scandalous affair all through. He was not only Philip's brother. He was also his guest in Rome at the time that he stole Herodias's heart. (*Joseph. Ant.* xviii, 5, 1.) He had, moreover, a wife of his own, to whom he had long ago been married, and who had been entirely faithful to him. She was the daughter of Aretas, King of Arabia. She fled to her father on discovering that it was the intention of her unfaithful lord to get her divorced, that room might be made for her sister-in-law. A bloody war—offspring of "the lusts that war in the members" (Jas. iv, 1)—was the result; and a total and humiliating defeat was suffered by Herod. Thus "hard," in the long-run, "is the way of transgressors."

Ver. 18. *For John said to Herod, It is not lawful for thee to have the wife of thy brother*:–The noble man had been faithful to the tetrarch. Instead of flattering him, as the cringing creatures of the court would be doing, by some subtle Machiavellian reasoning to the effect that *might was right*,—such reasoning as that of Callicles in Plato's Gorgias,—he boldly asserted the supremacy of right, and condemned the infamous marriage.

Ver. 19. *Therefore*: It is only *But* (δέ) in the original. The Geneva had *Therefore*, and hence its place in our Authorized Version.———*Herodias had a quarrel against him*: This is also the Geneva translation; but by no means happy. The translation in the margin of our Authorized Version is much better, *had an inward grudge*. The original expression is elliptical, (ἐνεῖχεν), and idiomatically keeps out of view the ugly thing that was inwardly cherished. She *cherished (resentment and hate) in her heart in reference to him*. The ellipsis is supplied by Herodotus in various passages, (χόλον). See i, 118; vi, 119; viii, 27.———*And wished to kill him*:–It is a plain and unvarnished way of speaking on the part of the evangelist. He calls a spade a spade. The unprincipled woman could not brook the outspoken integrity of the man of God, and schemed to get quit of his living voice and influence. She had inherited, in a marked degree, the haughty, domineering, and unscrupulous spirit of her grandfather George Buchanan, the prince of modern Latin poets, sketches her character and principles of action, with a masterly hand, in his drama entitled *The Baptist*.

but she could not: 20 for Herod [v]feared John, knowing that he was a just man and an holy, and [4]observed him; and when he heard him, he did

[v] Mat. 14. 5. Mat. 21. 26.

[4] Or, *kept him*, or, *saved him.*

---

He makes her say to the vacillating Herod, just as Callicles would have taught her to speak,—

> Father-in-law, friends, kinsmen, son-in-law,
> Brother and sister, citizen and foe,
> Are chains for poor men; empty words for kings.
> Whoe'er puts on his head a diadem
> Should fling aside all kinds of common duty,
> Think nothing base that's useful to a king.—*Scene Twelfth.*

———*And was not able*:—She could not compass her end, for the reason stated in the next verse.

Ver. 20. *For Herod feared John*: Kingliness changed places. The subject did not fear the sovereign. The sovereign feared the subject. He did not know what occult influences might be at the good man's disposal. But he felt that some influences or other, of a powerful and penetrating description, *did* vibrate into his heart and conscience, at the touch of the incorruptible preacher.———*Knowing him to be a righteous and holy man*: *Righteous* toward man, *holy* toward God. There was thus a part of Herod's soul that was, to some extent, responsive to the imperatives of righteousness and holiness. He bowed, though only, alas, at a distance, before the sceptres of these sovereign principles. But he was not prepared to be obedient to their behests.———*And observed him*: A wrong translation, and yet, strange to say, given by both Erasmus and Beza, and thence received into our Authorized Version. Tyndale, too, had taken the same view. His translation is, *and gave him reverence.* So too Vatable, Calvin (see his *French version*), Grotius, le Clerc, Beausobre, Wakefield, Fritzsche, Wahl, Bloomfield, Patritius. The translation of Webster and Wilkinson is also objectionable, *observed him strictly*, "as if he would see whether Herodias had any good grounds for her enmity." The word does not mean *observed*, but *conserved*, (συνετήρει), and so it is used in the other New Testament passages, where it occurs. See Matt. ix, 17, Luke ii, 19; v, 38. Rilliet's translation is, *and protected him.* Principal Campbell's is identical. And so the Vulgate, Coverdale, Henry Stephens, Jansen, Petter, Hammond, Elsner, Bengel, Bretschneider, Meyer, Alford, Lange, Grimm. Herod protected John against the machinations of Herodias, and hence *conserved* him, or, in accordance with our idiom, *preserved* him. Michaelis took the same view of the word, but rendered it, too interpretatively, *kept him merely as a prisoner.* ———*And when he heard him, he did many things*:—His conscience, being touched, he tried to make a compromise with it by doing a variety of good things from which he would otherwise have abstained. It is likely, however, that the expression *he did many things* (πολλὰ ἐποίει) is a tinkered reading, occasioned chiefly by the word *gladly* in the following clause. The original expression seems to have been, *he was greatly perplexed*, (πολλὰ ἠπόρει). Such was, for long, known to be the reading of the Vatican manuscript (B). It was also the reading of the Parisian manuscript L, and of the Coptic version. And now it turns out that the Sinaitic manuscript has the same reading. Ewald

many things, and heard him gladly. 21 And when a convenient day was come, that Herod on his [w]birth- [w] Gen. 40. 20.

approves of it, and so does Meyer. Tischendorf has, in his 8th edition, received it into the text. We cannot but accept it. See next clause.———*And he heard him gladly* :–Or with pleasure, (ἡδέως). A statement not at all inconsistent with the preceding; for there was inconsistency in the heart of Herod. He was not bad throughout; and he was far from being good throughout. There was still a tender spot in his conscience. The genius of John, his ready oratory, the unsophisticated grandeur of his character, his manifest and incorruptible integrity, his loyalty to God, his manly and undeviating devotion to a life of self-denial and godliness,—all these uncommon elements of idiosyncrasy would lend a nameless charm to his discoursings. The monarch would feel that he was in the presence of "an honest man," who was as great as he was good. But then the very charm of which he was conscious, by insinuating itself into his still susceptible conscience, and rousing the dormant forces that were there, would give occasion to a perplexing collision between a sense of duty, and a desire to enjoy the revelry that had established for itself a kind of prescriptive right, and a home, in his court. We need not doubt the reality of the collision. We need not, with Cardinal Cajetan, suppose that there was the mere simulation of respect for John, for fear of the people.—*(Ita Herodes exercebat hos virtutum actus.)* Yet de Lyra took the same view. Strauss gives emphasis to another supposed inconsistency,—the inconsistency of Herod's interest in John as here recorded, with what is said in Matt. xiv. 5, "*And when he would have put him to death, he feared the multitude, because they counted him as a prophet.*" (*Leben*, ii, 1, 44.) Meyer echoes this assertion of inconsistency. But inconsistently. It is not to be wondered at that the first promptings of Herod's haughty heart should have been to put to death the man who had dared to criticise the legitimacy of his marriage. But when a regard to public opinion had held back for a season his uplifted hand, time was given for resentment to cool, and conscience to utter its "still small voice." And perhaps, too, his infatuated attachment to his queen might have gradually become conscious of some thorns piercing into its quick. What wonder, then, that there should be some change in his feelings? Where is the inconsistency of the two accounts? There is not even what Ebrard would admit (*Wissenschaftliche Kritik*, p. 384), the "appearance of contradiction" (*Schein eines Widerspruches*).

VER. 21. *And an opportune day having come* :–*Opportune*, to wit, for Herodias carrying out a machination which she had been concocting in her heart. Principal Campbell's translation—modelled upon Mace's, and improved—is free, but admirable, *At length a favour ableopportunity offered.*———*That Herod* :–Or rather *when Herod* (ὅτε, not ὅ τε as in Lachmann, p. xliii.)———*On his birthday* :–Or, more exactly, *at his birth-day-festivities* (τοῖς γενεσίοις αὐτοῦ). The evangelist's phrase is not used in its current classical acceptation. Among the Attics it was generally employed, by a remarkable inversion of reference, to denote *the solemnities that were commemorative of decease.* (See *Hesychius* and *Phavorinus* in voc., and *Lobeck*, pp. 103, 184.) *Death* was treated as *a birth.* (Compare the ecclesiastical '*Genethlia.*' Suicer *Thes.* i, p. 747.) The evangelist,

day made a supper to his lords, high captains, and chief *estates* of Galilee: 22 and when the daughter of the said Herodias came in, and danced, and pleased Herod and them

---

however, uses the phrase in its primary and natural acceptation. It is said that the Jews in general disapproved of observing birth-day festivities. They esteemed "the keeping of birth-days," says Lightfoot, "a part of idolatrous worship." He adds, however, "perhaps they would pronounce more favourably and flatteringly of thine, O Tetrarch, because thine." (*Exercit. on Matt.* xiv, 6.) It is certain, at all events, that the Herods, after the manner of the great among the Egyptians, Persians, Greeks, and Romans, observed their birth-days with the utmost pomp and luxury. (See *Joseph. Ant.* xix, 7 1; *Persius Sat.* v, 180.)———*Made a supper to his lords*:-*Lords*, an excellent idiomatic translation of the original word, (μεγιστᾶσιν). It was a word, which came into use *after* the Macedonian era (*Lobeck ad Phryn*, p. 196 7), and literally means *chief ones* or *chiefs*. Salmasius says that it was probably introduced *by* the Macedonians. (*De Hellenistica*, p. 110.) Some of the Roman writers, such as Tacitus (*An.* xv, 27), and Suetonius (*Calig.* 5), adopted the term into the Latin language, *Megistanes*.———*High captains*:-Or, *high military-officers, chiliarchs*, as it is in the original, that is, *commanders of a thousand men*. These military dignitaries are specified, apparently, in contradistinction to the *lords*, or civil dignitaries.———*And chief estates of Galilee*: An old use of the word *estates*, denoting those whose *state* or *station* in society was conspicuous. Mace's translation of the clause is, *and persons of the first distinction in Galilee*. Old Purvey's translation is good, *the grettest of Galilee*. The *lords* and *high officers* would be the regular "habitués" of the court: *the grettest of Galilee* might comprehend all the other distinguished men of the district.

VER. 22. *And the daughter of Herodias having come and danced*:-This clause is in consecutive apposition with the initial clause of the preceding verse, *an opportune day having come*. The expression *the daughter of Herodias* is fuller in the original than it is easy to reproduce in English, (τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτῆς τῆς Ἡρῳδιάδος). Tyndale gave it, in lawyer-like phrase, *the doughter of the sayde Herodias*. In the "Great Bible," and the Geneva, and the Rheims, this legal technicality was softened into *the daughter of the same Herodias*. Wycliffe's version corresponded, but archaically, *the daughter of thilke Erodias* (i. e. of *the ilk*—"the same"—*Erodias*). Our Authorized Translators swung back from the Geneva to Tyndale's version. But the idea is rather that it was *Herodias's own daughter* who danced. The aim is not so much *to particularise the Herodias already referred to*, as to emphasise the fact that *instead of a professional dancing-girl, or Almeh, being employed, it was Herodias's own daughter* who was cunningly put forward *to act as a decoy to the heart of the susceptible monarch*. "I should conclude," says Dr. Lardner, "that this dance was a very unusual, if not a very singular piece of complaisance." (*Credibility*, vol. i, p. 17.) It was not customary for ladies of high rank to dance beyond the limits of the harem. The oriental dance, still more than the occidental ballet that was in use among the voluptuaries of Greece and Rome, was of a libertine character. It was seldom appreciated unless it made irruptions across the borders of decency. (See Sir Fred. Henniker's *Notes of Egypt, &c.*, pp. 72—74.)

that sat with him, the king said unto the damsel, Ask of me whatsoever thou wilt, and I will give *it* thee. 23 And he sware unto her, [x]Whatsoever thou shalt ask of me, I will give *it* thee, unto the half of my kingdom. 24 And she went forth, and said unto her mother, What shall I ask? And she said, The head of John the Baptist.

[x] Est. 5, 3, 6. Est. 7. 2.

---

Indeed Dr. E. D. Clarke imagines that "if the history of this exercise be traced to its origin, it will be found to have nearly the same character all the world over." (*Travels*, vol. v, p. 167.) Cicero, from his stand-point, said, "Scarcely any sober man dances, unless indeed he be mad," —(*Nemo enim fere saltat sobrius, nisi forte insanit.—Pro Muræna*, 6).——*She pleased Herod and his guests*:—Literally *those who reclined with him*, viz. around the *triclinium*, or around the suite of *triclinia*. The dancing would take place over against the vacant part of the squares of ground, that were, on three sides, occupied with the couches. (See Ciacconius, *de Triclinio*, p. 85, and Ursinus's *Appendix*, p. 374.) The dancing-women of the east used tambours of various kinds, and sometimes had little bells attached to their fingers to make musical jingling. They sang too. The Princess Salome's dancing and singing would, we may suppose, be more elegant, and more captivating, than any exhibition of mere professional Almehs. Herodias,—a very "serpent under femininitee" (*Chaucer*, 4,780) —would artfully introduce, moreover, such a piquant portion of the entertainment, just at the right time, and by way of conferring upon her lord, as from herself and her daughter, a very special honour.——*And the king said to the damsel, Ask of me whatsoever thou wishest, and I shall give thee*:—Flushed with flattery, inflamed with wine, and touched to the heart by the gratification which had been contrived for him by the mother of Salome, he felt in his most magnificent and generous mood, and wished to make the elegant *danseuse* the very best present she could desire. Hence the *carte blanche* of promise, which, not without a liberal infusion of ostentation, he put into her hand in the presence of his applauding guests.

Ver. 23. Salome, abashed by the magnificence of the promise, and wincing too, let us hope, under the reproaches of her maidenly modesty, on which she had been so wantonly trampling as she danced, may have hung her head for a little, in mingled diffidence, perplexity, and shame. The spectacle moved still more the excited and gratified voluptuary. He "came out stronger" still, and made efforts to assure her.——*And he swore to her, Whatsoever thou mayest ask me, I will give to thee, even to half of my kingdom*:—A most extravagant promise, in which one can easily trace the infatuating effect of voluptuous indulgence, and vanity, and ostentation. Perhaps the inflated potentate imagined that he was rivalling the magnificence of "the great king Ahasuerus" in the promise which he made to Esther. (*Esth.* v, 3, 6.) *Even to half*:—Our English idiom, like the Greek, admits of the suppression of the article. Purvey's translation of the clause is, *though it be half my kyngdom.*

Ver. 24. *And she went out and said to her mother, What shall I ask?*—Or rather, according to the reading of the best manuscripts, and all the modern critical editors, *What should I ask?* (αἰτήσωμαι *instead of the* αἰτήσομαι *of the Received Text.*)——*But she said, the head of John the Baptizer*:—Nothing would be so sweet,

25 And she came in straightway with haste unto the king, and asked, saying, I will that thou give me by and by in a

---

apparently, or so dear to her, as the gratification, however coarsely, of her vindictive feelings. And hence too the laconic form of her answer to her child. Somewhat of the ferocity may doubtless be legitimately attributed to the spirit of the age; but still a large residuum remains of what was savage and unfeminine in the character of Herodias.

Ver. 25. *And she came in immediately with haste to the king*: *Immediately*, without loss of time; *with haste*, with alacrity in her steps, and unhesitating determination in her bearing. "*Avec empressement*" is the felicitous translation of the modern editions of the French Geneva, as also of Beausobre and Lenfant, and Rilliet. She had been re-inspired by contact with her mother; and was herself, no doubt, a thorough Herodine.——*And made her request, saying, I wish that thou shouldest give me instantly, on a platter, the head of John the Baptist*:—Note the peremptoriness of the *instantly*, (ἐξαυτῆς). The word is translated *immediately* in Acts x. 33; xi, 11; xxi, 32, *straightway* in Acts xxiii, 30, and *presently* in Phil. ii, 23. These are all the other passages in which it occurs. In the passage before us it is rendered *even now* in the Geneva, *straightwaye* by Coverdale, *anoon* (i.e. *in oon, in one instant*) by Wycliffe, *immediately* by Mace and Wakefield, *at once* by Sharpe, *forthwith* by Edgar Taylor, *now* by Norton, *presently* by Young,—all of them correct translations. So is our Authorized Version, got from Tyndale, *by and by*, only the expression has, in modern parlance, drifted from its former moorings. When our Authorized Version was published, it just meant *immediately*, as is evident from the other three passages in which it occurs, Matt. xiii, 21; Luke xvii, 7; xxi, 9. In all these cases it is the rendering of the adverb which is generally translated *immediately* or *straightway*. By the time of Dr. Samuel Johnson, however, the phrase had got to mean, as he defines it, "in a short time,"—although, in the examples which he adduces, it really means *instantly*. '*By*' denotes *at the side of, close upon*. In '*by and by*,' as originally used, the *steppings* of the phrase were *inward* as it were, and thus the nearness expressed was nearness advancing still nearer. But the *steppings* of the phrase seem *outward* now, and thus the nearness recedes to a stage beyond.——*On a platter*:—Or *salver*, as Brameld renders it. Wycliffe, Wynne, Wakefield, Norton, Edgar Taylor, Sharpe, Alford, Godwin, use the more generic *dish*. Newcome, Pr. Campbell, Ro. Dickinson, have *basin*. The Rheims has *platter*. The Authorized Translation has *charger*, a word now antiquated, but formerly meaning a large 'assiette,' which was *charged* with, or on which was carried, a *cargo* of meat. (See *Comment. on Matt.* xiv, 8.) The maiden indicated that it would be, as it were, the consummation of the feast to her and her mother, if the Baptist's head were presented to her. It was needful, in her opinion, that it should be actually presented *to herself*, no doubt that she might satisfy herself that no inferior head had been surreptitiously substituted in its place. "Agrippina, wife of Claudius, and mother of Nero, who was afterwards empe-"ror, sent an officer to put to death Lollia Paulina, who had been her rival for "the imperial dignity. And Dio Cassius says, that when Lollia's head was "brought to her, not knowing it at first, she examined it with her own hands,

charger the head of John the Baptist. 26 And the king was exceeding sorry; *yet* for his oaths' sake, and for their sakes which sat with him, he would not reject her. 27 And immediately the king sent [5]an executioner, and commanded

[5] Or, *one of his guard.*

"till she perceived some particular feature, by which that lady was distinguished. "I have put down this instance, because it seems to give us the reason of this "practice among great people, namely, that they might be certain their orders "had been executed." (*Lardner's Credibility*, vol. i, p. 17.)

VER. 26. *And the king though made exceedingly sorry on account of the oaths and the guests did not choose to reject her* :–There is a possible ambiguity in the evangelist's collocation of the clauses. But the meaning evidently is, that, notwithstanding the king's exceeding sorrow, *he chose*—'*for the sake of his oaths and his guests*'—*not to repudiate his rash promise to the princess.* The reason of his exceeding sorrow was to be found in his inward respect for John, and his desire to "have his own way" in reference to him, notwithstanding the wishes and schemes of his consort.—*On account of the oaths* :–Or, as it is in the Authorized Version, *for his oaths sake.* Note the plural number. He had repeated, and perhaps re-repeated, his *oath.* In multitudes of the reprints of the Authorized Version the word *oaths* is misprinted *oath's* instead of *oaths'* or *oaths.* In the primary edition of 1611 there is no apostrophe at all.———*He did not choose* :–He did not wish (and will).———*To reject her* :–A free phrase, meaning *to repudiate her demand*, or, *to deny her request.* Literally, *to displace her* : namely, from that standing-room which she got by his promise, and of which she had taken unhandsome advantage in preferring such an unwelcome request : ———Was it right in Herod, it has often been asked, to choose not to displace Salome, and consequently to murder John? It is sufficient to answer, that it can never be right to do wrong. But what then of the obligation of his oaths? He was conscious of their force. But still they could not bind him to do wrong. No power in the universe can ever make it right to do wrong. But is it not doing wrong to violate an oath? No,—if the oath were itself entirely wrong ; (*rei illicitæ nulla obligatio*, Sanderson, *De Juramenti obligatione*, ii, 13). The making of such an oath, is the first wrong-doing. The keeping of it is the second. When one has begun wrong, repentance, as even Seneca teaches, is more honourable than pertinacity. (It is one of the bad effects of *ira*, he says, that *in male cœptis honestior pertinacia videtur quam pœnitentia.* De Ira, i, 16.)——— When it is said that Herod had regard *to his guests*, as well as *to his oaths*, the meaning probably is, not that "these persons joined in with the request" of Salome, out of dislike to John, as Dr. A. Clarke supposes, but that the tetrarch could not brook the idea of doing in their presence what would lower him in their estimation, seeing they were themselves witnesses of the fact of the unconditional promise.

VER. 27. *And immediately the king sent off one of his body-guard* :–The evangelist, instead of employing a Greek term (δορυφόρος), uses a Latin technical word, which was at that time in fashion, *speculator*, (not *spiculator*, as Erasmus and Beza give it. See, especially, Golling's exhaustive *Monograph* on the term.) This Latin word originally meant *a scout*, but came by and by to denote, more

his head to be brought: and he went and beheaded him in the prison, 28 and brought his head in a charger, and gave it to the damsel: and the damsel gave it to her mother. 29 And when his disciples heard *of it*, they came and ‖took up his corpse, and laid it in a tomb. ‖ Acts 8. 2.

---

generically, a military attendant on high officers in the army. At length it was used to denote one of the armed body-guard of the Roman emperor. (See Sueton. *Calig.* 44; *Claud.* 35; Tacit. *Hist.* ii. 33, &c.) Herod Antipas imitated the manners of the Roman court, and hence,—like Claudius (Sueton. 35),—had in attendance a company, or little "cohort," of *speculatores*. These *speculatores* were employed, when occasion required, as *executioners*. (See Seneca, *De Ira*, i. 16, and Gelling, *ut supra*.) But it was by no means their distinctive characteristic to act in this capacity; and hence the translation in our Authorized Version is apt to suggest too narrow an idea. This idea was revoltingly exaggerated by Tyndale, who rendered the expression, '*the hangman*.' Yet Coverdale, the Geneva, and the Rheims, followed in his wake. Wycliffe's version was not so offensive, but it was wrong nevertheless, *a manqueller*, i.e. *a mankiller*.———*And commanded to bring his head*:—Or, as it is freely rendered by Mace, *with orders to bring the head of John the Baptist*.———*And he went off and beheaded him in the prison*: According to Josephus, it was in the strongly fortified fortress of Machærus, east of the Dead Sea, that John was beheaded. (*Antiq.* xviii. 5, 2.) If this be the case, then Herod must have kept the anniversary of his birth-day in the magnificent palace which his father had built within that fortress. (See *Joseph. War*, vii, 6, 2.) Renan assumes that the feast must have been celebrated there. (*Vie de Jesus*, chap. xii, p. 197.) So does Hepworth Dixon (*The Holy Land*, p. 288), and many others. And yet it is possible that Josephus may just have taken for granted that John was put to death in the castle where he was originally confined; and it may have been the case that he had been removed to Tiberias, the favourite residence of Herod. The fact that *the estates of Galilee* only, and not *those also of Peræa*, are specified as having been present at the festival, rather favours this supposition.

VER. 28. There is a small difference about the commencement of this verse. Our translators have followed the division of Robert Stephens the verse-maker. But Beza and Henry Stephens made a modification of the division. They began the 28th verse with the preceding clause, *And he went off and beheaded him in the prison*. The Elzevirs followed them, and thence too all the great continental editors, earlier and later, Bengel, Wetstein, Griesbach, Matthæi, Scholz, Lachmann, Buttmann, Tischendorf.———*And brought his head on a platter, and gave it to the damsel, and the damsel gave it to her mother*:—A fit presentation for cannibals, or other savages, whether living in a palace or a wigwam.

VER. 29. *And when his disciples heard of it, they came and took up his corpse, and laid it in a tomb*:—Or, as Wycliffe has it, *in a buriel*. They *took up*, viz. from the ground, *the fallen thing*, (τὸ πτῶμα). It was not the noble man himself whom they took up, and buried. He was "away," (2 Cor. v, 8). It was but his prostrate "remains."

30 [z]And the apostles gathered themselves together [z] Luke 9. 10.
unto Jesus, and told him all things, both what they had
done, and what they had taught. 31 And he said unto
them, Come ye yourselves apart into a desert place, and
[a]rest a while: for there were many coming and [a] Acts 27. 33.
going, and they had no leisure so much as to eat. 32 And

---

Vers. 30—33 constitute a little paragraph, introductory to the paragraph contained in verses 34—44. It is of great intrinsic interest. It contains, says Dean Alford, "one of the most affecting descriptions in the Gospels." Corresponding statements are found in Matt. xiv, 13; Luke ix, 10, 11; and John vi, 1—3.

Ver. 30. *And the apostles*:-The only instance in Mark, in which the word *apostles* is found. But, as Bengel remarks, it is with peculiar fitness that it is introduced, (*apta huic loco appellatio*). The disciples had just completed their first apostolic tour.———*Gathered themselves together*: Or passively, as Erasmus, Beza, Bretschneider, Grimm, give it, *are gathered together*. Luther, however, and Tyndale, and Bengel, give the middle acceptation, as in our Authorized Version. The two meanings are coincident.———*Unto Jesus*:-Whose movements in the interval are not indicated by Mark. But see John v, 1—47.———*And they reported to him all whatsoever they did and whatsoever they taught*:-In the Received Text there is a conjunction after *all*,—*and they reported to him all*, '*both*' *whatsoever* (καὶ ὅσα) *they did, and whatsoever* (καὶ ὅσα) *they taught*. But it is not found in the best manuscripts, or in the best old versions. And hence it is omitted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, and should most likely be left out. The returned apostles went into full details of their whole procedure.

Ver. 31. *And he says to them*—in a spirit of fine human sympathy,—*Come ye yourselves apart into a desert place, and rest yourselves a little*:-*Ye yourselves*, that is, *ye by yourselves*. Erasmus renders the phrase *ye alone* ("vos soli").———*Apart*:-Or *privately*, as the expression is rendered in the following verse, and in Matt. xxiv, 3; Mark ix, 28; xiii, 3; Luke ix, 10; x, 23; Acts xxiii, 19; Gal. ii, 2. It is Beza's rendering, *(privatim)*.———*Into a desert place*:-There were many such places in the neighbourhood of the lake of Gennesaret, more especially on its eastern side,—places not only uninhabited, but uncultivated, in consequence of the predominance of bare rocks.———*And rest yourselves a little*:-That is, *a little while*.———*For they who were coming and going were many*:-There was a constant stream of visitors, arriving and departing.———*And they had not sufficient leisure even to eat*:-The very times for their meals were constantly intruded on by the never-ceasing influx of individuals and groups, who were eager to hear the great Rabbi, or to witness his wonder-working. The proximity of the greatest of the festivals, that were celebrated at Jerusalem, would give occasion for a large increase of visitors. See John vi, 4.

Ver. 32. *And they departed to a desert place by the boat privately*:-"By *the* boat," which was at our Saviour's disposal, and which he generally employed. (See Chap. iv, 36.) The desert place, for which they set out, was, as we learn from Luke ix, 10, near "a city called Bethsaida." Reland

they departed into [b]a desert place by ship privately. [b] Luke 9. 10.
33 And the people saw them departing, and many knew him, and ran afoot thither out of all cities, and outwent them,

---

conjectured that there must have been two towns of this name, *(Fish-town)*,—one in Galilee proper, in the tetrarchy of Herod Antipas, and the other in Gaulonitis, in the tetrarchy of Philip. (*Palæstina*, pp. 654–5.) One of the towns would be *Bethsaida of Galilee* (John xii, 21), the city of Peter and Andrew and Philip. (John i, 44.) The other was on the east side of the Jordan above its embouchure into the lake. (*Joseph. War*, iii, 10, 7.) It was increased and adorned by the tetrarch Philip, and called Julias in honour of the emperor's daughter (*Joseph. Ant.* xviii, 2, 1.) It would no doubt be to some secluded spot in the vicinity of this eastern Bethsaida, in the tetrarchy of Philip, that our Lord retired with his disciples. There is reference to the other Bethsaida in verse 45. Baur (p. 51) and Ewald, however, suppose that the place referred to must have been the Galilean Bethsaida on the western side of the lake, or near to Capernaum. Unlikely.

VER. 33. *And the people saw them departing*: *The people*, or rather *the crowds*, (*οἱ ὄχλοι*). The expression, however, has most likely been imported into the text from the parallel passages in Matt. xiv, 13, and Luke ix, 11. It is not found in any of the uncial manuscripts, nor in "the queen of the cursives" (33), nor in the Ancient versions, the Italic, Vulgate, Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, Æthiopic. We must take up the word *many* from the next clause, and use it as the nominative to the verb *saw*, as well as to the following verb *knew*,—*And many saw them departing and knew them.* Notwithstanding the Saviour's desire to get off *privately*,—by night perchance,—many had been hovering about, and noticed their departure, and, though it was dusk, identified them. Instead of *knew them* (*αὐτούς*) it is *knew him* (*αὐτόν*) in the Received Text, and in EFGHISVΓ. But it is *them* in ℵAKLMUΔΠ, and 33 "the queen of the cursives," as also in the Syriac Versions, and the Coptic, and Æthiopic. This *them* is received into the text by Tischendorf, in his 8th edition. Rightly, Griesbach, Lachmann, Tregelles, Alford, omit both *them* and *him* on the authority of the Vatican and Cambridge manuscripts (BD), and the fine cursive manuscript of Basle (1). If it should be the case that the *them* was really omitted in the original text, it is needful, at all events, to supply it mentally.———*And ran afoot thither out of all cities*: Or, more literally, *and on foot from all the cities (they) ran together thither*, (*καὶ πεζῇ ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν πόλεων συνέδραμον ἐκεῖ*), that is, *and 'people' on foot from all the cities ran together in the direction that was taken by the boat* in which our Saviour and his disciples were. The reference is not exclusively to those who saw the disciples setting off. (Comp. Matt. xiv, 13). They are artlessly merged, so far as the evangelist's narrative is concerned, in the greater multitudes who were influenced by their report. The body of the people would probably set out early in the morning, before sunrise, according to the oriental custom. They were *on foot*, or *afote* as Tyndale has it;—not *in boats*. They *ran together*, or as the Rheims has it, felicitously, *they ranne flocking.*———*And outwent them*: Or, as Wycliffe has it, *and came bifore hem* (i.e. *before them*), viz. to the place of destination. The Rheims version has the fine old word *prevented*, in its primitive old-fashioned acceptation, *and prevented them.* (Comp.

and came together unto him. 34 And Jesus, when he came out, saw much people, and was moved with compassion toward them, because they were as [c] sheep not having a shepherd: and he began to teach them many things. 35 [d] And when the day was now far spent, his disciples came unto him, and said, This is a desert

[c] 1 Ki. 22. 17.

[d] Mat. 14. 15. Luke 9. 12.

John 6. 5.

---

Matt. xvii, 25; 1 Thess. iv, 15; Ps. lxxxviii, 13.)———*And came together unto him*:–These words are omitted altogether in the modern critical editions on the authority of ℵBLΔ, and the Vulgate, Peshito-Syriac, Coptic, and Armenian versions.

Vers. 34–44,—the paragraph to which verses 30—33 are introductory. It contains a simple, but graphic, account of the miraculous feeding of Five Thousand Persons in a desert place. Compare Matt. xiv, 14—21; Luke ix, 11—17; John vi, 5—13.

Ver. 34. *And when he came out, he saw a great crowd*:–Such is the reading in Griesbach, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, without the word *Jesus*. *When he came out*:–Viz. of the boat. Even before he disembarked, the moment that he emerged from the little cabin, –in which, as we may presume, he had been snatching some repose, (compare chap. iv, 38),—he would witness the collected crowd. Most probably the vessel would lie at rest a considerable time, on the still waters, to allow of repose.———*And was moved with compassion toward them*: A fine translation of the original expression, (ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐπ' αὐτούς); as is also Purvey's, though it is not equal to that of our Authorized Version, *and hadde reuth on hem*. All that was "within" our Lord was tenderly agitated "over" the people. (See Buttig's admirable monograph on the word, *De Emphasi* σπλαγχνίζομαι.)———*Because they were as sheep not having a shepherd*: A very sad case in a land of only partial pasturage, and utterly unenclosed, running off too at many a point into defiles and gorges, which are the natural haunts and dens of wild beasts.———*And he began to teach them many things*:–Instead of taking the rest, for which he had longed, and which was so desirable at once for himself and his disciples, he *began* to teach the people; and having begun, he was drawn on, and still on, until the day was far advanced.

Ver. 35. *And when the day was now far spent*:–A fine free idiomatic translation, obtained from Tyndale. Wycliffe's version is very literal, *and whanne moche our*—(i.e. *much hour*)—*was maad now*, that is, *and now when it was become late*. It becomes late in the day, when *much hour*, or *much time*, has come to pass. In the reading of the Sinaitic and Cambridge manuscripts, (ℵ D),—a reading adopted by Tischendorf in his 8th edition,—the verb is in the present participle, instead of the past, (γινομένης, not γενομένης), *and now when it is becoming late*.———*His disciples approached him, and said, The place is desert*:–And hence there would be no hamlets dotting it, in which the multitudes could get provisions for themselves. The farmers and workers did not, as a rule, live in detached houses, but clustered together in larger or smaller villages.———*And now the time is far spent*:–Or literally, "*and now much hour*," that is, *and now it is much hour,—it is late*. The Romans had an idiom corres-

place, and now the time *is* far passed: 36 send them away, that they may go into the country round about, and into the villages, and buy themselves bread: for they have nothing to eat. 37 He answered and said unto them, Give ye them to eat. And they say unto him, Shall we go and buy two hundred [6]pennyworth of bread, and give them to

[6] The Roman penny is seven pence halfpenny; as Mat. 18. 28.

---

ponding to that of the Greeks; they spoke of *much day*, when they meant to intimate that it was late,—(*multo die*). The disciples very properly and correctly took note of the facts of the place and of the time. But what then?

Ver. 36. *Dismiss them*:—But why obtrude ultroneously such a counsel? It was officiousness;—well meant indeed, but not well weighed.———*In order that they may go into the surrounding fields and villages*:—Wherever they might come upon *fields*, or *cultivated spots*, they would be sure to find a hamlet or hamlets hard by. ———*And buy for themselves bread, for they have nothing to eat*: Or, according to the greatly abbreviated reading that is given by Tregelles, Alford, and Tischendorf in his 8th edition, —*And buy for themselves what they might eat,* (*ἀγοράσωσιν ἑαυτοῖς τί φάγωσιν*). This short reading approved itself to Mill (*Prolog.* p. xliii). It is supported by B "the Vatican manuscript," and by L Δ, and, in the main, by ℵ too "the Sinaitic," and D also "the Cambridge;" and by the Vulgate Version likewise, and the Coptic, and the bulk of the Italic Versions, the precursors of the Vulgate. It is more likely that the longer reading grew out of the shorter, than that the shorter was crumbled down from the longer.

Ver. 37. *But he answered, and said to them, Give ye them to eat*:—An injunction that was eminently fitted to lay their officiousness on the one hand, and to quicken their consideration, on the other, into an attitude and intensity of thoughtfulness, that would fit them for a due appreciation of his intended miracle.———*And they say to him*: Perhaps one after another, each echoing his companion's remark. But it was Philip who was the original spokesman. (John vi, 7.) ———*Should we go and buy two hundred pennyworth of loaves, and give to them to eat?* (*ἀ̓ώσωμεν*, the right reading):—Should we hasten to the nearest villages, and get, let us say, two hundred pennyworth of loaves? That quantity, at the very least, would be needed, to admit of every individual receiving a little. (John vi, 7.) It is *loaves*, or *cakes*, not generically *bread*, that is the evangelist's word. See next verse. The *penny* that is spoken of was a silver penny, the common Roman silver money, the *denarius*,—somewhat equivalent to a shilling in our English money, but not so large. Though not so large, however, it would buy far more among the Jews, than we can at present buy with a shilling in Great Britain. The relation between money and commodity continually varies. There was a time when bullion was so scarce, comparatively, in our land, that a sheep could be bought for two shillings and sixpence. (See Jacob's *Precious Metals*, chap. xii.) It is needless then to try to estimate the number of loaves that would be obtained for two hundred denarii. Lightfoot mentions that this amount of money,—corresponding to two hundred *zuzim* in Hebrew money, or fifty shekels,—was a kind of standard sum in relation to large liabilities.

eat? 38 He saith unto them, How many loaves have ye? go and see. And when they knew, they say, Five, and two fishes. 39 And he [e] commanded them to make all sit down by companies upon the green grass. 40 And they sat down in ranks, by hundreds, and by fifties.

[e] Mark 8. 6.

---

And hence, he imagines, it was not unlikely that it was mentioned indefinitely by the disciples, "because it was a most celebrated sum, and of very frequent mention in the mouths of all." (*Exercitations*, in loc.) Grotius, on the other hand, and Hofmeister, and Dr. S. Clarke, and others, assume, with greater verisimilitude, (compare John vi, 7,) that *two hundred denarii or thereby* would be the amount that happened to be on hand in the common *purse*, '*bourse*,' *byrsa*, or "bag," of the disciples. (See John xii, 6; xiii, 29.) The phrase *two hundred pennyworth of loaves* does not originally and literally mean, as Alexander supposed, *loaves of two hundred denarii*. But the whole expression means, *should we buy*, '*with*' *two hundred denarii, loaves?* See 1 Cor. vi, 20.

VER. 38. *But he says to them, How many loaves have ye? Go and see* :–Or, as Tyndale has it, *Goo and loke*. "Questions," as De Veil remarks, "are not always signs of ignorance, but are sometimes employed for the benefit and instruction of those who are interrogated."———*And when they knew, they say, Five, and two fishes* :–They had made no provision for luxurious entertainment in their retirement.—*Fishes* : -Dried, of course, according to a common custom of the country, and intended to be eaten as *opsonium*, or, as the Scots would express it, as "kitchen."

VER. 39. *And he ordered them*—the disciples to wit—*to cause all to recline by companies on the green grass* :–Mark alone mentions that the *grass* was *green*. It is an interesting *autoptic* observation which had been made to him by his informant. During a great part of the year there is not such a thing as a blade of *green grass* to be seen on the slopes that ascend from the eastern shores of the sea of Tiberias. All the grass that remains is browned and scorched. But, as we learn from John,—though John alone,—it was now spring time, just before the passover festival. (John vi, 4.) The whole district, therefore, would be richly carpeted with beautifully green grass, except at those spots where the bare rocks protruded.—*By companies* :–Or, *in parties*. Luther and Coverdale render the expression, *by tablefuls*. Our word *parties*, in its convivial acceptation, is, as nearly as possible, a reproduction of the original term, (συμπόσια συμπόσια). The multitude was to be arranged *in a suite of parties*, no doubt *semicircularly* adjusted, after the form of Roman *triclinia*, or Grecian *symposia*. Such a semicircular or three-sided style of parties had become common among the Jews, being adopted from the Greeks and Romans; and hence the frequent reference, in the New Testament, to *reclining at meals*.

VER. 40. *And they sat down* : Or rather, *and they lay down, or reclined*. The verb represents *the act of falling backward*, (ἀνέπεσαν). It is translated *leaned* in John xxi, 20.———*In ranks* :–Like *leek-beds* in a garden, (πρασιαὶ πρασιαί). They were symmetrically arranged in parallelograms, but of course with the fourth side free. They were ranged, that is to say, in a succession of *triclinia*. ———*By hundreds and by fifties* :–This does not mean, as Fritzsche and Meyer suppose, *in companies which were in some cases a hundred in number, and in*

41 And when he had taken the five loaves and the two fishes, he looked up to heaven, and / blessed, and brake / 1 Sa. 9. 13.

Mat. 26. 26. Luke 24. 30. John 6. 11.

*some cases fifty.* It represents such a symmetrical arrangement of the whole suite of parties, that, viewed in one direction, *in rank*, from end to end of the respective triclinia, there was a succession of semicircular hundreds, in tier beyond tier; whereas, when viewed laterally, or *in file*, counting off one at a time from each of the semicircles or triclinia, there was a succession of fifties. Viewed from front to back, there were fifty hundreds; viewed from side to side there were a hundred fifties; that is, there were *five thousand guests*. (See verse 44.) Wetstein and Wesley understood the arrangement, though probably erring in reversing the proportions of *rank* and *file*. They counted *fifty by a hundred*, instead of, as the evangelist, *a hundred by fifty*. Fritzsche and Meyer have both misunderstood Wetstein,—strangely supposing that he made out each company to consist of *a hundred and fifty*. Erasmus Schmid interested himself in the arithmetical phase of the matter, and has inserted in his New Testament *two large plans of the parties*. But he missed the idea of *triclinia*, and accordingly did not bend his hundreds into continuous semicircles, or what was equivalent to three sides of a parallelogram or square. Dr. Adam Clarke too got perplexed in his conception; for, on referring to Mr. Wesley's perspicuous representation, he says, "But if they sat fifty *deep*, how could the disciples conveniently serve them with the bread and fish?" The answer is obvious, Just because the fifties,—or rather the hundreds, for Mr. Wesley reverses the ratios,—were not packed closely together. Each hundred constituted a distinct *party* or *triclinium*, and would be separated by a convenient interval from all the other hundreds. The whole suite of hundreds, however, though thus conveniently separated from each other, would bend up on the slope semicircularly and overlappingly, one beyond another.

VER. 41. *And having taken the five loaves and the two fishes, he looked up to the heaven and blessed:—Blessed*, or *gave thanks*. See John vi, 11. He *gave thanks for the food*, and in that sense *blessed it*. See Luke ix, 16. The English word *bless*, like the corresponding Anglo-Saxon word before it, has got confused in its applications. When man *blesses* man, he gives him *bliss* (Ang. Sax. *blis*), or *makes him 'blithe.'* In this way too, but reverently understood, does God *bless* man. But we also speak, in consequence of biblical idioms,—of *blessing God*, as likewise of *blessing those blessings* with which *we are blessed by God*. The Greek word is radically different both from the Hebrew term and the English. It means *to speak well of*, (εὐλογέω), and can thus, wheel-like, be turned round toward any being or thing that has any point in it of either actual or possible good. Our Saviour, on the present occasion, would doubtless *speak well of his Father;* and, coincidently, he would *speak well of the provision*,—his Father's device and gift,—which he was about to distribute and increase. He might *speak well*, too, *in reference to the people*, petitioning for their weal. He would thus coincidently *bless* the Father, *bless* the food, and invoke *blessing* on the people. As he *blessed*, he *looked up to the heaven*,—thus, in the outer sphere of things, instinctively representing the elevation of his thoughts, in their own inner sphere, above the mere

the loaves, and gave *them* to his disciples to set before them; and the two fishes divided he among them all. 42 And they did all eat, and were filled. 43 And they took up twelve baskets full of the fragments, and of the fishes. 44 And they that did eat of the loaves were about five thousand men.

---

materialisms that were around him and beneath him. "In prayer," says Petter, "we should use such outward gestures as may most fitly serve to "express the inward disposition, and holy affections of our heart and soul." ———*And brake the loaves*:—Literally, *and broke down the loaves*, viz. into several pieces. The Jewish loaves, it should be remembered, were of the form of *cakes*.———*And gave to the disciples*:—Viz. the broken pieces.——— *To set before them*:—The verb that is here employed by the evangelist was the accredited term, used by the Greeks, to denote the action of servants in *placing the meat on the table beside the guests*, (παρατίθημι).———*And the two fishes he portioned out to all*:—Viz. through the hands of the disciples, as the bread had been. The disciples would in all likelihood pass, in the first instance at least, along the respective termini of the semicircular rows, and hand a portion of food to each individual at the extremities. As the portion was diminished, lo it increased! It would be easy to speculate on the *how*, but difficult to determine it. It would be easy to speculate along different lines of possibility. But it is unnecessary, and would be unprofitable. Let what is divinely veiled in this matter, continue veiled. But nothing except what involves a contradiction is "too hard for the Lord." (Jer. xxxii, 17.) He who can produce a forest of oaks from a single acorn, and in one spawn of a cod-fish can give existence, at one point of time, to a brood of no less than three millions, six hundred and eighty-six thousand, seven hundred and sixty units of life, could be at no loss to condense, indefinitely, molecular action in time, and coincidently expand it in space.

Ver. 42. *And all ate and were satisfied*:—So the word is rendered in Chapter viii, 4. In all other passages of the New Testament it is freely translated *filled*. It properly means *foddered*, (ἐχορτάσθησαν). Purvey has it here *and weren fulfillid*,—showing finely the primitive meaning of *fulfilled*. (Comp. Chaucer 5,079.)

Ver. 43. *And they took up of fragments twelve baskets-full*:—Or, *twelve basket-fuls*. Very literally, *fillings of twelve baskets*. Wycliffe uses the word *coffins* instead of *baskets*. It is the original term, and is connected with *coffers*. It denoted, as used by the Greeks and Romans,—for they both employed it,—a sort of basket that was commonly used by Jews. Compare Juvenal, iii, 14; vi, 542.———*And from the fishes*:—This clause is inartificially added to the preceding one; but its meaning is quite obvious. The fragments collected were not only *from the loaves*, but also *from the fishes*.

Ver. 44. *And they who ate the loaves*:—Such is the simple form of the expression in the original text. It has been mollified by our Authorized Translators, *they that did eat 'of' the loaves*. In Tyndale's version the expression is simply *they that ate*, for in Erasmus's editions the words, *the loaves*, were wanting. They were inserted, however, in the Complutension New Testament, and thence copied into Stephens's editions, and Beza's, and the Elzevirs. They are want-

45 And [g] straightway he constrained his disciples to get into the ship, and to go to the other side before unto Bethsaida, while he sent away the people.

[g] Mat. 14. 22. John 6. 17.

---

ing, however, in the Vulgate Version, and in 8D, and in most copies of the Italic version. Yet they were no doubt in Mark's autograph. — Under the outstanding word *loaves* there is of course a silently subtended reference to the *fishes*. ——— *Were five thousand men*: Such is the reading of 8BDE, and other eight of the uncial manuscripts, as also 33, and 69, and the Italic, Vulgate, Coptic, Peshito-Syriac, Philoxenian-Syriac, and Æthiopic versions. The *about* of the Received Text had doubtless been added from Matt. xiv, 21. Note the word *men*. It is not the generic term, but the specific, (*ἀνδρες*). There were also *women and children* (Matt. xiv, 21); but these, according to oriental custom, would eat *by themselves*. Aye, even in the presence of the Saviour! They would be *sitting* apart, not *reclining* like the men. How beneficent, humanizing, civilizing, and literally '*familia*rising,' is that spirit of Christianity—the embodied spirit of the Saviour which breaks down the middle-wall of partition between the sexes, by asserting that, in respect of privilege, "there is neither male nor female." (Gal. iii, 28.)

VERS. 45—52. Compare for corresponding paragraphs, Matt. xiv, 22—33, and John vi, 15—21.

VER. 45. *And straightway*: The word employed is Mark's favourite *immediately*, - immediately after satisfying to the full the wants of the multitude. ——— *He constrained his disciples to enter into the boat*: They appear to have been loath to go without their Master. And no wonder. A gentle but decisive *constraint* was required, ere they would consent. ——— *And to be going on before to the other side toward Bethsaida*: That is, toward the Galilean Bethsaida. (See on verse 32.) Lange and Klostermann strangely suppose the reference to be to the eastern Bethsaida. John says that they went "toward Capernaum" (vi, 17), so that we should infer, that the Galilean Bethsaida and Capernaum lay in one direction, as viewed from the point of departure at the north-east of the lake. The site of Bethsaida is not yet absolutely determined; but Dr. Robinson, after long uncertainty, fixed on *et-Tabighah* as the probable spot. (*Later Researches*, pp. 358 9.) Dr. Porter acquiesces in this decision. "No site," he says, "along the shore is so well adapted for a fishing town. Here is a bay "sheltered by hills behind, and projecting bluffs on each side; and here is a "smooth sandy beach, such as fishermen delight in. The strand forms a "pleasant promenade, and so far answers to the description in Matt. iv, 18—22." (*Syria*, p. 405.) "The beautiful white beach of Bethsaida," says Mr. Macgregor, "is gracefully bent round its pretty little cove in a gentle slope of gravel, shells, "and purest sand."—"The bay is admirably suited for boats. It shelves "gradually. The anchorage is good, and boats can be safely beached. Rocks "project at the south-west end about fifty yards beyond those seen above "water. These would form a good protection to the harbour. There appears to "be no jetty. The water is deep, and nearly free from boulders until near the "south-west end." (*Rob Roy*, p. 351.) St. Willibald, who visited the Holy Land about the middle of the eighth century, found Bethsaida still in existence, just a little north of Capernaum. There was a church in it. A little farther

46 And when he had sent them away, he [h]departed into a mountain to pray.

[h] Mark 1. 35. Mat. 6. 6. Luke 6. 12.

47 And when even was come, the ship was in the midst of the sea, and he alone on the land. 48 And he saw them [i]toiling in rowing; for the wind was

[i] Jon. 1. 13.

---

north, he found Chorazin. (*Vita*, §§. 16, 17.)———*Until he dismisses the crowd*:–The Lord wished the disciples to be going on by themselves, *until he succeeded in getting the crowd dismissed*. He goes no farther in his measurement of time, than this dismission; though he intended, as we learn from what follows, to be occupied alone for a number of hours thereafter. He simply assured his disciples that he would meet them on their way to Capernaum. They might imagine that he might either walk round by the shore, and hail them as they coasted along westward; or that he might join them, more rapidly and directly, by means of *a 'little' boat*. (See John vi, 22, Gr., and also *Rob Roy on the Jordan*, p. 355).

Ver. 46. *And when he had sent them away*:–Rather too free a translation, though exactly reproducing the Vulgate Version. The expression bore upon it a stamp of politeness, and had got, by the evangelist's time, to be technical and idiomatic. It means, not so much *when he had dismissed them*, or *given them their leave*, as *when he had taken leave of them*. Such is the translation that it receives in Acts xviii, 18, and 2 Cor. ii, 13. It is translated *to bid farewell* in Luke ix, 61; Acts xviii, 21. Phrynichus pronounces the phrase unclassical. Be it so. Yet it got to be quite common in the Alexandrian style of writing, and is used by both Philo and Josephus. (See *Krebs and Kypke on Luke* ix, 60.) The reference of the pronoun *them* is evidently to *the people*; not to *the disciples*, as Beza supposed.———*He departed into a mountain*: It is *the mountain* in the original, that is, *the adjoining high-land*, at the sloping base of which the multitude had been fed. The whole district is mountainous. "On the east of the lake of Tiberias," says Dr. Porter, "the banks are nearly "two thousand feet high, destitute of verdure and of foliage, furrowed by "ravines, but flat along the summit, from which the plain of Bashan extends "eastward." (*Syria*, p. 394.)———*To pray*:–It is the fine generic term that is employed, (προσεύξασθαι), not the specific term that is used in John xvii, 9, 15, 20, and which properly means *to ask*, (ἐρωτάω). The Saviour would no doubt *ask* as he *prayed*. But he did more. *He addressed himself, in a generic way, to his Father*. He opened up heavenward his spirit, and let all that was within him ascend, in a stream of inwardly articulated aspiration, to his Father.

Ver. 47. *And when evening was come*:–The *late evening*, that extended from sun-down onward.———*The boat was in the midst of the sea, and he alone upon the land*: A wind had sprung up that was blowing them in from the coast. This continued for hours, the wind increasing. See next verse.

Ver. 48. *And as he saw* (ἰδών) *them toiling in rowing*:–*Toiling* is a feeble word to express the force of the original term βασανιζομένους). *Travelinge* is Wycliffe's word; *troubled* is Tyndale's; the Rheims has *labouring*, and so too have Worsley and Norton; Wakefield has *harassing themselves*; Young, *harassed*; Brameld, *severely-harassed*. But Archbishop Newcome hit on a better word still,—*distressed*. Alford has adopted it. The Greek word properly means *tormented*.

contrary unto them: and about the fourth watch of the night he cometh unto them, walking upon the sea, and

---

The expression, freely rendered *in rowing*, literally means *in the driving*, that is, *in the propelling*, viz., of the boat by rowing. The disciples had to make the most violent and distressing efforts to keep the boat from drifting before the hurricane, and being dashed to pieces on the opposite shore.——*For the wind was contrary to them*: Blowing therefore from the north-west.——*About the fourth watch of the night*: That is, as Lightfoot remarks, "after cock-crowing." The Jews, like many other peoples, divided the night into *watches*, or those portions of time that were occupied by relays of sentinels. These *watches*, according to the native Jewish division, were three. But the Roman custom was to have four; and to this custom, which would naturally attach itself to the military establishment of the Herods (Acts xii, 4), the later Jews conformed themselves. Hence the reference here to *the fourth watch*. It is exceedingly arbitrary in Ewald, and quite uncalled for, to render the expression here, "about the *third* night-watch" *(um die dritte nachtwache.)* The fourth watch extended from "cock-crowing" till sunrise, that is, from about 3 A.M. to about 6 A.M., just as the third watch extended from midnight half-way to sunrise, that is, to about 3 A.M. The first and second watches divided the time from sunset to midnight.——*He cometh to them, walking upon the sea*: Which would just be as easy to him as to walk anywhere else,—if indeed *He and the Father* were *One*. The "progress" of Divinity, within his own dominions, cannot be confined to humanly constructed roads, or solid ground.——*Upon the sea*: Koppe, while lecturing on one occasion extemporaneously,—as Lavater records,—threw out the wild idea, that this expression might mean *on the shore!* The shore, forsooth, being higher than the sea, our Saviour, when walking on it, might be truthfully represented as walking *above the sea!* (Compare the French expression, *Boulogne sur mer.*) Next morning Koppe wisely withdrew his grotesque conjecture. But the great apostle of 'rationalism,' H. E. Gottlob Paulus, reinvented the interpretation in 1794, and thenceforward earnestly and learnedly contended for it, as one of his happiest achievements in the way of eliminating everything supernatural from the Gospels! The daringness of the exegesis, as well as the ridiculousness of the little-mouse-of-idea that came forth from it, roused into activity several able pens, but none so effective and trenchant as that of the celebrated J. K. Lavater, who at once denounced the interpretation as silly *(dumm)* and shameless *(frech)*. How is it possible, he asks, that three evangelists should record the Lord's walking, and its accompaniments, as something marvellous, at which the disciples were "sore amazed in themselves beyond measure," if the whole matter just amounted to this, *that the Saviour actually went, and was actually able to go on the solid ground?* The exposition proposed he designated "philological legerdemain" *(philologische Taschenspielerei)*. It is, he says, "a laughable insult on logic, hermeneutics, good sense, and honesty." *(H. E. Gottlob Paulus und seine Zeit, Band* i, pp. 268–308.) J. A. Bolten's notion is nearly as ridiculous as that of Paulus, and in some respects still more revolting. He translates the expression thus,—*he came to them 'swimming'!* Such feats of exegesis almost amount to a transference of miracles. The wonders are eliminated, indeed, from the Saviour's life;

*j* would have passed by them. 49 But when they saw him walking upon the sea, they *k* supposed it had been a spirit, and cried out: 50 for they all saw him, and were troubled. And immediately he talked with them, and

*j* Luke 24. 28.
*k* Luke 24. 37.

---

but they are thrust into the phraseology of his biography, under the transformed shape of prodigies of philological manœuvre.———*And would have passed by them*: Literally, *and wished to go past them.* Fritzsche thinks that the idea is that *he wished to finish the feat of crossing the entire sea on foot*, and was only drawn aside from his purpose by the agitation of his disciples. Surely too theatrical a notion. Ewald contends that the phrase must mean, *and wished to go over 'to' them,*—to *go over (the water), in order to reach them.* Norton had had the same idea. His translation is, *and wished to join them.* It is a violent philological strain; and brings out, moreover, when the preceding clause is considered, a redundancy of idea. Lange's notion is that the disciples were rowing in the wrong direction—easterly, and that the Saviour *wished to go on before them to shew them the right way*—westerly. But the evangelist gives no hint to the effect that the disciples were on a wrong tack. Bishop Wordsworth thinks that "here is a silent note of *Inspiration.*"—"For who knoweth the *mind* of Christ but the Spirit of God?" But what if the evangelist is just describing *the appearance of things?* Jesus, instead of coming all at once directly to the disciples, comes near them indeed, but holds on his way as if he wished to go past them. "He made as though he would have gone further," (Luke xxiv, 28; Comp. Gen. xviii, 3). Did he really, then, wish to leave them behind, struggling in the storm? We need not suppose it. We cannot for a moment suppose it. But his real wish, nevertheless, would be a complex thing. He would wish his disciples to recognize him. He would wish them to understand distinctly what he was doing, and what he had done, and what it was in his power to do. He would wish to pass onward by their side, and in their view, till it should be the very best moment to turn and give them relief. (Comp. Gen. xxxii, 26.) If that moment should not occur till he had himself reached the shore, he would have held on his way. There was no duplicity. There was merely, as infinitely became him, a complexity of desires, founded on a complexity of contingences. "In the nature of the thing," as Jeremy Taylor remarks, "it is proper and natural, by an offer, to give an occasion to another to do a good action." (*Christian Simplicity, Works,* vi, 156).

Ver. 49. *But when they saw him walking on the sea, they thought, It is a spectre*:-Such is the literal version of the original reading, as preserved in the manuscripts ℵBLΔ, and 33—"the queen of the cursives," (ὅτι φάντασμά ἐστιν). The object of the thought of the disciples is presented in the direct form of speech, just as it would start up in their minds, and leap out from their lips.—*A spectre*:-The proper meaning of the word; or *apparition,* the word of Mace and Pr. Campbell. Wycliffe's version is, *a fantum*: the Rheims, *a ghost.* ———*And they cried out*:-In fright. They shrieked.

Ver. 50. *For all saw him, and were troubled*:-They were *agitated* and *confused.* The word occurs, in all, some seventeen times in the New Testament, and is always rendered *troubled.*———*But he immediately talked with them*:-When he saw them so agitated, and perceived that they misunderstood the

saith unto them, [l]Be of good cheer: it is I; be not afraid. 51 And he went up unto them into the ship; and the [m]wind ceased: and [n]they were sore amazed

[l] Isai. 43. 2.

[m] Psa. 93. 3, 4. Mark 4. 39.

[n] Mark 4. 41.

---

case, he at once *entered into communication "with them"* by word of mouth. ———*And says to them, Have courage! It is I; fear not*:–It was thus that he began to *talk*,—soothingly and inspiritingly.

VER. 51. Mark passes over in silence the incident of Peter's petition, and the consequences that ensued. (See Matt. xiv, 28—31.) Why this silence? We cannot tell. We can only guess. And guessing in such a case is of little avail. Hilgenfeld sees in the *suppression* of the incident,—an incident so little creditable in some respects to Peter,—a proof of the *Petrinism* of Mark's Gospel. (*Die Evangelien*, pp. 136, 137.) D'Eichthal sees no evidence of *suppression* at all, but supposes, on the other hand, that in Matthew we have a new sprouting and later growth of the older myth as given in Mark. The same is the opinion of Sholten (*Het oudste Ev.* p. 297) and Meyer. But it is, of course, a mere opinion and dream. There may be a thread of truth in Hilgenfeld's notion. It is quite possible that something of the nature of reverence for the chief of the original apostolate, may have inclined the evangelist, since he was condensing at any rate, to stride rapidly onward to the conclusion of this section of his narrative. The private peculiarities, in thought and feeling, of the respective writers of the Gospels were not ignored, and still less obliterated, by the inspiring Spirit, but respected and wielded, when not inconsistent with the great end divinely contemplated,—*the faithful exhibition of the wonderful personality of our Saviour in his manifold relationships to the manifold wants of men.*———*And he went up unto them into the boat*: The expression implies that the boat was of some magnitude, comparatively speaking, and standing considerably out of the water. At the stern especially it would be elevated, according to the ancient style of naval architecture. The little cabin would be there. The term employed in John vi, 21 is the same; whereas the term that is employed in the two following verses of John's narrative is different, meaning *a little boat*, or *yawl*. Possibly the disciples used a little boat, by which to get into their larger boat. (See on ver. 45.)———*And the wind ceased*: It *fell*, as if thoroughly *exhausted*. Such is the graphic idea suggested by the evangelist's expression, (ἐκόπασεν). It was just, it would appear, as the Lord stepped on board (Matt. xiv, 32), that the blast subsided. He who is the Lord of all the elements willed it. When the wind blows, or ceases to blow, it is,—when we go to the ultimates of things,—at His behest. When any movement, great or small, in things material, takes place, we must, if we would understand the case, go "back of" what is visible and tangible. We could not otherwise get to the Cause of causes. Mind is behind matter. If it were not, matter could not be, —for *scientific principles are wrought out* in all its elements and interrelations. "*Thou* didst blow with *thy* wind," says Moses, on the one hand, *to* God. (Exod. xv, 10.) "*He* maketh the storm a calm," sang the Psalmist, on the other, *of* God. (Ps. cvii, 29.)———*And they were exceedingly beyond measure amazed in themselves*:–Note the cumulative expression, *exceedingly beyond measure*. Not only was the amazement *beyond measure*, it went *exceedingly*

in themselves beyond measure, and wondered. 52 For they considered not *the miracle* of the loaves: for their heart was °hardened.

° Mark 8. 17.

---

beyond it. Our English word *sore*, used in our Authorised Version, (Scottice *sair*), is just the German *sehr*,—*very* or *much*. The word rendered *amazed* (ἐξίσταντο) is in itself exceedingly strong. Its cognate noun is '*ecstacy*.' The disciples started out of themselves, as it were, and then *stood out of themselves!* That is the graphic idea. We sometimes speak in English of a person being *out of himself* for joy. The disciples were *out of themselves* with wonder. And yet it is added by the evangelist, *in themselves*. The expression seems to indicate that the amazement was inwardly felt still more than outwardly expressed. It did not get vent, to any remarkable degree, in outward exclamations.——— *And wondered*:—This expression is still further cumulative though—when viewed rhetorically—it does not exalt or crown the representation. It seems, on the contrary, to be somewhat tame. It is omitted altogether in the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts (ℵB), as also in LΔ and 1, and in the Vulgate Version and the Coptic. It has been left out of the text by Tregelles, Alford, and Tischendorf (in his 8th edition). It was suspected by Griesbach. It was condemned by Mill (Prol. §. 403). Even Beza suspected it; and Erasmus before him. We have no doubt, however, that it is genuine. The very fact that it appears to be—when merely rhetorically considered—a somewhat "lame and impotent conclusion," militates strongly against the likelihood of its insertion by a transcriber. And the same fact accounts for its silent omission in the case of that small number of transcribers who have left it out. It would seem to them, not unnaturally, to be a redundancy, and a redundancy in which the representation dropped off flat. There is, however, no real redundancy, or tameness, or lameness. Not only were the disciples suddenly struck with amazement. After that sudden "ecstasy" was past. (ἐξίσταντο), they *continued more collectedly and thoughtfully in a wondering mood* (ἐθαύμαζον, *imp.*) In Acts iv, 7, we have the same conjunction of phrases.

Ver. 52. *For*:—The evangelist explains why it was that the disciples were merely confounded and astonished.———*They considered not the miracle of the loaves*: Not quite a felicitous translation; for there is no evidence that the disciples neglected *to consider*. Instead of *considered*, Tyndale has *remembered*. But the word so rendered (συνῆκαν) is, in every other passage but one (2 Cor. x, 12), rendered *understood*. And that is its meaning here. It is Wycliffe's word, (*vndirstoden*). The primary import of the Greek term is *to send together*. He who sends out his mind to an object, so as to bring together both the subject and the object of thought, *understands*. He who does not thus send out his mind, that a union of subject and object may be effected, *does not understand*. The disciples *did not understand*. The whole expression, if very literally rendered, would be, *for they did not understand 'upon' the loaves*. It is *condensed* phraseology. The meaning is,—*they did not take their standpoint 'upon' the miracle of the loaves, so as to see things in their true light, as they might have done, and should have done*. If they had taken their standpoint of survey 'upon' the miracle of the loaves, they would have *understood*, and not merely *wondered* that the Saviour should have walked on the waters, and tamed the

53 [p]And when they had passed over, they came [p] Mat. 14. 34.
into the land of Gennesaret, and drew to the shore.

storm by a simple act of quiet volition. They would have seen that nothing was more natural than that He, who rules absolutely within the spheres of the flora and the fauna, and their products (such as *loaves* and *dried fish*), should also rule absolutely within the spheres of the inorganic elements of wind and water.——*But their heart was hardened*:—In the *Received Text*, and hence, in our *Authorized Version*, the conjunction is *for* (γάρ) and not *but* (ἀλλ'). It is *but*, however, in both the Sinaitic and the Vatican manuscripts (ℵB), as also in "the queen of the cursives" (33), and LSΔ. This reading is supported by the Coptic Version, and the margin of the Philoxenian-Syriac. It has been received into the text by Tregelles and Tischendorf. Rightly. It is the more difficult reading, and yet opens up a deeper vein of thought. The evangelist is not giving a reason why the disciples did not understand. He had already subindicated the reason,—*they did not take their standpoint 'upon' the miracle of the loaves*. He is giving, *on the positive side*, a description of that state of mind, which, in the preceding clause, he had characterized *on its negative side*. *Their heart*: That is, *their mind*, viewed in its intellectual constituents. There is no reference here to the emotional element of our nature. The reference, as Alexander remarks, is to "sluggishness and obtuseness of intellect," not to "callous feeling or insensible affection." (See chapter viii, 17.) The word is used in its accredited biblical sense, as denoting *the interior and central part of our being*, that is, *the spiritual* or *mental part*,—that part which is, as Carus expresses it, *the seat of consciousness* (*Psychologie der Hebräer*, p. 283). *Was hardened*: Was in a *callous* condition,—intellectually insusceptive, and thus intellectually irresponsive to the appeals which were addressed to it by the wonder-working of the Lord.

VER. 53. *And when they had passed over they came into the land of Gennesaret*:—Or, according to the reading of the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts (ℵB), and "the queen of the cursives" (33), a reading accepted by Tischendorf, and supported by LΔ,—*and when they passed over to the land, they came to Gennesaret*, (διαπεράσαντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἦλθον εἰς Γεννησαρέτ). The expression *when they passed over to the land*, is another instance of condensed phraseology,—a specimen of "much in little." The meaning is, *when they came 'upon' the land, having finished their 'passage across the lake.'* When this took place, they found themselves at some point or other of Gennesaret,—that fine rich level tract of country which was the principal theatre of our Lord's public career on earth, and in which Capernaum and Bethsaida were situated. Josephus calls it *Gennesar*, and so does the Syriac-Peshito version in the passage before us, as also the fine old Cambridge manuscript (D). It is, says Josephus, about thirty furlongs in length, and twenty in breadth. (*War*, iii, 10. 8). "Its nature is "wonderful," he says, "as well as its beauty. Its soil is so fruitful, that all "sorts of trees can grow upon it; and the inhabitants accordingly plant on it all "kinds. The temperature of the air is so well mixed, that it agrees with the "different kinds. Walnuts, which require cold air, flourish there in the "greatest abundance. Palm trees also, which grow best in heat. Fig-trees "likewise and olives, which require an air that is more temperate. One may

54 And when they were come out of the ship, straightway they knew him, 55 and ran through that whole region round about, and began to carry about in beds those that were sick, where they heard he was. 56 And whithersoever he entered, into villages, or cities, or country, they laid the

---

"call this place the Ambition of nature, where it constrains those plants which "are naturally enemies to one another to agree together. It is a happy strife "of the seasons, as if every one of them laid claim to this country, for it not "only nourishes different sorts of autumnal fruit beyond men's expectation, "it preserves them a great while. It supplies men with the principal fruits, "with grapes and figs, continually, during ten months of the year, and the rest "of the fruits, as they become ripe together, through the whole year." Such is Josephus's description of Gennesar, to which our Lord and his disciples returned from the east.———*And drew to the shore*:–Not quite a literal rendering. Neither is Tyndale's translation,—*and drue up into the haven*. The expression simply means, *and were moored*, (προσωρμίσθησαν). It is left uncertain, so far as the word is concerned whether the mooring was effected by dropping the anchor in the roadstead, or by being chained to the landing place. The noun from which the word is derived, (ὅρμος), denotes primarily *a chain*, and then an *anchorage*.

VER. 54. *And when they were come out of the boat, straightway they knew him*: The people of the locality immediately identified him. This might be the case even though they had never seen him before. The Rheims version is, "incontinent they knew him." He was now the Cynosure of all eyes.

VER. 55. *And ran about the whole of that region*:–Informing the people at large of the arrival of the wonderful Healer.———*And they began to carry about on their couches those who were unwell, wherever they heard that he was*:–The people of the district, when informed of the arrival of the great Healer, began immediately to trace his steps, carrying with them from place to place, in their pursuit, the invalids on whom they wished him to operate. As to the kind of couches referred to, see on chap. ii, 4. Fritzsche is scandalized by the expression *carry about*, and is sure that the evangelist must have used a different term, (προσφέρειν). He simply failed to realize the scene depicted. There was nothing "spectacular" intended. The expression *wherever they heard that he was*, is simple, graphic, and quaint, in the original, *wherever they heard, He is there*. The report heard is given in the direct form, and the local *there* may have been determined by pointing with the finger, or by previous naming. In the texts, however, of both Lachmann and Tischendorf, the *there* is omitted, on the authority of ℵBLΔ, and the Syriac-Peshito, Gothic, and Æthiopic versions. The phrase thus reads *wherever they heard (that) he is*. The *there* must be mentally supplied; and hence apparently its early insertion in the margin, and thence in the text.

VER. 56. *And wheresoever he entered into villages, or into towns, or into fields*: The preposition is repeated in the Sinaitic, Vatican, and Cambridge manuscripts, and is inserted by Tischendorf in his 8th edition. Rightly. *Wheresoever*:–In and around Gennesaret. The evangelist is now widening his reference. *Into fields*:–where cultivation was going on, and where, consequently, people were

sick in the streets, and besought him that they might touch
[q] if it were but the [r] border of his garment: and as [q] Chap. 5. 27.
many as touched [7] him were made whole. Mat. 9. 20.

Acts 19. 12. [r] Num. 15. 38. [7] Or, *it*.

to be found in numbers.———*They laid the sick in the streets*:-It is rather surprising that our translators used the word *streets* here. The term means, not *streets*, but *market-places*, (ἀγοραῖς). It is everywhere else, in the New Testament, rendered either *markets* or *market-places*. (See Matt. xi, 16; xx, 3; Mark xii, 38; Acts xvi, 19, &c.) Yet the Geneva and Tyndale, as well as Wycliffe and the Rheims, have also *streets*. The reason is that the Vulgate has *streets* or *broadways* ('in *plateis*.') That too is the reading of the Cambridge manuscript (D), and the rendering of the Syriac versions, as well as of the Coptic and Gothic. It is a small matter, but *market-places* is the right reading, and the only right rendering. Coverdale gave it, led by the hand of Luther, (*auf den Märkt*). And no other reading or rendering would ever have been thought of, had it not been for a certain simple interminglement of things in Mark's composition. The *market-places* of the east were sometimes inside the towns, and sometimes outside. But they were always the chief places of resort. They "were equivalent," says Webster-and-Wilkinson, "to our village greens." The interminglement of Mark's composition, referred to, consists in this, that he speaks as if there were market-places in *fields*, as well as in the *towns* and *villages*. No doubt he intended his expression regarding the *market-places* to be applied only to the *towns* and *villages*, of which he had spoken. And as regards the *fields*, the sick would be laid there in places corresponding to the market-places in towns and villages. They would be laid, that is to say, in *the most convenient places*,—the places perhaps where the workers assembled, under some friendly shade, at the time of the midday siesta. The evangelist's form of speech is a kind of *zeugma*.———*And entreated him that they might touch, if it were but the border of his robe*:-The *that* refers to the aim of the entreaties presented, (ἵνα). They *entreated him 'in order that' the sick people might touch*. The word, which we have translated *robe*, denotes the outer garment, that was worn over the tunic. The term rendered *border* (κρασπέδου) is supposed by some to mean *tassel*. But it is likely that it just means *edge*, *border*, *fringe*, or *hem*. (See on Matt. ix, 20, and xxiii, 5.)———*And as many as touched him were made whole*: They were *physically saved*, (ἐσώζοντο). They became *sound in health*. In the margin the pronoun *him* is rendered *it*, as if the reference might be to the *garment* or its *border*. So it might, so far as the pronoun is concerned. Our translators gave the alternative, following in the wake of Beza. Le Clerc, in his French version, accepts the alternative (*qui le touchoient*). But almost all other translators and expositors suppose that the evangelist's mind was looking to the Saviour himself, although he required to look *through the drapery* of the representation of the preceding clause. Correctly, no doubt. In whatever way the sick people got touching our Lord, there was virtue for all of them who were recipient.

## CHAPTER VII.

*Pharisees and scribes from Jerusalem find fault with the disciples of Jesus, for eating with unsanctified hands,* 1—5. *Jesus exposes the hollowness of the censorious judgement,* 6—8; *and sharply reproves them for making void through their traditions a very weighty matter of the law,* 9—13. *He declares to the people that it is the things which proceed from men that render them unholy,* 14—16. *His disciples ask him what he means by this declaration,* 17, *and he explains it to them,* 18—23. *He then departs into the borders of Tyre and Sidon, and heals the daughter of a woman who was a Syrophenician by nation, but of great faith,* 24—30. *He returned by and by toward the sea of Galilee, passing through the midst of the coasts of Decapolis, and delivers a person who was deaf and dumb,* 31—36. *The people were amazed, and exclaim—"He hath done all things well,"* 37.

THEN [a]came together unto him the Pharisees, [a] Mat. 15. 1.

## CHAPTER VII.

In Verses 1—16 we have an account, (1) of the way in which our Lord was malevolently assailed by the Pharisees and scribes, on account of his disciples' neglect of a customary ceremonial usage, and (2) of the remarkably firm, faithful, and home-thrusting manner, in which he met and repelled the assault. A parallel paragraph is found in Matthew xv, 1—11.

Ver. 1. *Then*:—In the original it is the simplest of all conjunctions,—Mark's continually recurring *And*. In using it so very frequently, he shows how thoroughly the constructive part of his phraseology was moulded on primitive Hebraistic simplicity.———*Came together unto him*: Or rather, *Come together unto him*. We are taken back, in imagination, by the narrator, and are present at the assembling. The same expression is rendered in Chapter vi, 30, *gathered themselves together*. It might be rendered passively,—*are gathered together to him*. But certainly it is not meant that it was by any external compulsion that they were collected. They were self-moved. Neither is Lange's idea to be entertained, that they came together "in synagogue-form," as a formal court of inquisition *(in Synagogenform zur Rüge)*. Still less is there any likelihood in the very different idea of Michaelis that the persons referred to *put up at the residence of Jesus as his guests*, (kehreten bey ihm ein). ———*The Pharisees*:—The evangelist uses the article artlessly. He does not mean of course that *the Pharisees in a body* came. He really means that *certain Pharisees* came, (see Matt. xv, 1), though he did not intend his article to convey the idea expressed by our word *certain* or *some*. Neither did he intend it to

and certain of the scribes, which came from Jerusalem.
2 And when they saw some of his disciples eat bread

---

be used *indefinitely*. He was simply thinking of '*the*' *Pharisees* as distinguished from other classes of society. It was some of '*the*' *remarkably self-assuming self-righteous class of people,* who gathered together 'unto' our Lord. ———*And some of the scribes*:–There had been a smaller proportion of these, and hence the selective expression, *some of*. It is not meant, that the *scribes* were not Pharisees. Most likely they were. But they were a specific and limited fraternity or guild, and hence they are distinguished from the generic class to which they belonged. (See chap. i, 22.)———*Who came from Jerusalem*: The authorities in the capital city had got concerned about the influence of the remarkable Galilean Rabbi, and seem to have thought it high time to take some cognizance of his proceedings and doctrines. And hence some commissioners were delegated either formally by the Sanhedrim, or at the instance of some of the high officials, or it might be only of some of the officious,—to go down to Galilee and make inquisition. They would have no doubt the true scent of inquisitors in their nature. They would be chosen because of their adaptation for the ignoble employment. They would be sleek, sanctimonious, sly, secretive, and splendid splitters of hairs. Cunning men and able, we may presume, but remorseless withal, and unprincipled. They knew not, however, with whom they had to do.

Ver. 2. *And when they saw*:–It is better to regard this clause as a simple continuative addition to the last clause of the preceding verse; thus,—*who came from Jerusalem, and saw.* It is in vain to seek in Mark, or to force upon his artless composition, precise rhetorical construction. Mill puts a full point at the close of verse first. So did Beza. So do Wetstein, Matthæi, Griesbach, Scholz, Fritzsche, Lachmann, Tischendorf. Meyer did so too in his 1829 edition of the text; but he threw it out in the second edition of his Commentary (in 1846), and has adhered since then to the simple continuative construction. Bengel too has merely a comma at the close of verse first. So has Erasmus in his various editions of the text, (though not of his translation). ———*Some of his disciples eat*:–The expression in the original is, *that they eat,* (ὅτι ἐσθίουσιν). It is not, as the Greek scholar will notice, *that they ate.* The verb *they eat* is given, as it were, in the direct form of report, as presenting immediately the object seen. *They saw some of his disciples.*—Well, what is it that they saw about them? This to wit—*They eat.* (Compare chapter vi, 55, last clause.)———*Bread*: The expression in the original is very primitive, *the loaves,* that is, *the cakes,* those namely that were lying before them.———*With defiled hands*:–Perhaps a strong enough translation. The word is *common* in the margin; and that is the proper and distinctive meaning of the evangelist's term, (κοιναῖς). Compare Acts ii, 44; iv, 32; Tit. i, 4; Jude 3. In the Geneva version the word in the text is *common,* but the alternative-word in the margin is *filthie,* a far more objectionable term than that employed in the text of our Authorized Version. Our translators would be influenced by Beza, who has *polluted* in his translation, and vindicates it in his *Annotations.* Erasmus has *common.* So had the Vulgate. So have Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, and the Rheims. The Gothic version has *common*

with [1] defiled, that is to say, with unwashen, hands, [1] Or, *common.*

*(gamainjaim)*, but the Anglo-Saxon *defiled (besmitenum)*. The disciples' hands were as men's hands *commonly* were. The hands of all heathens, however cleansed, were in the condition objected to on the part of the Pharisees. They could never be anything else than *common*, unless the persons who owned them became proselytes to Judaism. Michaelis's translation conveys admirably the idea of the original, *with unholy hands*. Wakefield gives the same translation. Mace's version corresponds, *with profane hands*. Kypke pleads for the word *profane*. It is admirable when taken in its original import. The expression does not — to the least degree — intimate that there was any *physical impurity* attaching to the disciples' hands. ——*That is to say, unwashed*:—The evangelist explains what the Pharisees meant (see verse 5) by the expression *common* or *unholy*, as applied to the hands. *Unwashed*, that is, *(ceremonially) unwashed;* for, according to the Pharisees' doctrine, it was necessary to perform, before eating, the ceremonial lustration, although the hands should be perfectly clean in a physical point of view. It was not physical cleanliness which they esteemed. It was not physical uncleanliness which they reprehended and denounced.

Ver. 3. The evangelist interrupts the continuity of his narrative by introducing a historical note in reference to the ceremonial customs of the Pharisees and the Jews in general. The note is really parenthetical, though not formally so; and hence it is unnecessary to throw verses 3 and 4,—as Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles have done,—within the forms of a parenthesis. The introductory phrase of verse 5 is *not* intended to dovetail into the construction of verse 2. It starts a new detail. The language is aggregative. Thing is added with simplicity to thing. ——*For the Pharisees, and all the Jews*: The Pharisees in particular, and all the Jews in general. In the matter about to be specified, all classes of Jewish society were in accord, Sadducees included. But the Pharisees, with characteristic obtrusiveness, made most of the matter, and acted as if they were the divinely appointed conservators and guardians of the public consistency and orthodoxy. ——*Except they wash the hands oft, eat not*:—The word translated *oft* (πυγμῇ) is one of *the crosses of the critics*, and has occasioned a very extraordinary amount of research and discussion. The ancients themselves, who lived comparatively near to the evangelist's time, and were familiar with Greek as a spoken language, regarded the word as peculiar and debatable. Hence in the old Latin versions—the 'Italic'—which preceded Jerome's Vulgate, it receives quite a variety of translations (*pugillo, prius crebro, primo, momento, subinde*). The word literally means *with closed hand*, or *with the fist*, (compare πύξ). But what the evangelist could mean when he says *except they wash the hands 'with closed hand,'* looks perplexing enough. Had it been the case that there was satisfactory evidence, derivable from the Rabbinical writers, that the Jews were accustomed to close the operating hand when washing the other, so that the hand operated on was rubbed, not with the palm but with the knuckled part of its fellow, —that part which washerwomen use when washing clothes, then there would never have been any dispute concerning the evangelist's meaning. But there is no such evidence, although the whole extent of Rabbinical literature

they found fault. 3 For the Pharisees, and all the Jews,

---

has been carefully ransacked. Some eminent critics, nevertheless, such as Beza, Fritzsche, Meyer, Grimm, adhere to the idea that Mark must have meant that the washing was performed *with the fist*. The same opinion seems to have been entertained by Michaelis, who, in his translation inserts a long paraphrase of the word (*wobey aber das Waschen für genug gehalten wird, wenn auch die Faust geballet ist*). Grotius had somewhat of the same notion, only he supposed that the meaning is—that the fist was washed by the other hand. (*manum in pugnum compositam manu altera lavabant*). This seems almost to reverse the picture of the process that is naturally suggested by the evangelist's expression. Yet Calov approves of it. Lightfoot took an entirely different view of the phrase. He thought that the debatable word meant *to the wrist*. Hammond, Whitby, Wells, Bengel, took the same view. But (1) the word in itself does not mean *the wrist*, and (2) even though it did, the form in which it is employed could not mean *as far as the wrist*, or *up to the wrist*. Le Clerc saw this, and hence, in his Latin translation of Hammond, as well as in his French translation of the Gospel, he interpreted the word as meaning *by putting the fist into water* (en mettant le poing dans l'eau),—an interpretation, however, that involves almost as large an amount of arbitrariness as is characteristic of the explication which he rejects. Theophylact exaggerates Lightfoot's notion, and interprets the word as meaning, *up to the elbow* (ἄχρι τοῦ ἀγκῶνος), because, says he, the term does mean *the length from the elbow to the tips of the fingers*. Certainly the term is a measure of length *from the elbow to the fingers*—(strictly, it would appear, *to the closed fingers, see Stephens's Thesaur. sub voc.*); but it is difficult to see how it could ever be the case that the evangelist's expression could mean *up to the elbow*. Louis Cappel, however, took the same view, (*Spicileg.* in loc.); and le Cene, Elsner, Beausobre-et-Lenfant. So did Mace: he translates *up to the elbows*. So does Godwin: he translates the whole phrase thus,—*unless for a pigmy's length they wash the hands and arms*. But (1) the Greek word *pygme* does not mean *a pigmy*, and (2) there is nothing in the original text that corresponds to the appended expression *and arms*. Scaliger, Drusius, Cameron, and many others, take substantially the view of Theophylact, though under a peculiar phase derived from one of the petty precepts of the Rabbis regarding ceremonial purification. The Rabbis enjoined that a double washing of the hands should be attended to before eating. In the first of the two, *the hands were to be held upward that the polluted water might run off at the elbow*. In the second, which "purified the water of the first washing," the hands were to be held downward! (See *Buxtorf's Lexicon Talm.* p. 1,335.) The critics named suppose that the evangelist has reference to the elevation of the hands. The evangelist's expression, however, remains as puzzling as ever, both (1) as regards the fact that it is *the fist*, or *closed hand*, that is spoken of, and (2) as regards the form of the phrase '*with*' *closed hand*. Wetstein –followed by Wakefield and Principal Campbell—takes an entirely different view. He supposes that the debatable word means *a handful (of water)*. Hence Wakefield translates, *for the Pharisees and all the Jews never eat 'without throwing a handful of water over their hands.'* Principal Campbell

except they wash *their* hands [2]oft, eat not, holding the

[2] Or, *diligently:* in the original, *with the fist:* Theophylact, *up to the elbow.*

translates correspondingly, *For the Pharisees, and indeed all the Jews, eat not until they have washed their hands, 'by pouring a little water upon them.'* It is an ingenious cutting of the knot. But it is entirely unwarrantable. The debatable word does not mean *a handful.* The debatable expression—standing absolutely, as it does—cannot mean *a handful of water!* What, then, are we to make of the phrase? Our Authorized Translators have rendered the disputed word, *oft.* It was Wycliffe's rendering, and Tyndale's, and Coverdale's. It was the rendering of the Anglo-Saxon version (*gelomlice*), and of the Gothic (*ufta*). It was adopted too into the Geneva, and reproduced in the Rheims. It was Erasmus's rendering. More than all, it was the rendering of the Vulgate. (*crebro*),—the fountain-head of the whole series of repetitions. Erasmus conjectured that the debatable word was a corruption, and that Mark must have used another word that signifies *frequently,* ('πυκνῶς aut πυκνά aut πυκνῇ'). The translation therefore, so far as Erasmus is concerned, is founded on a conjectural reading. And it is not unlikely that Jerome himself was just as completely puzzled as Erasmus; and hence the Vulgate Version. It is a remarkable fact, however, that one of Erasmus's conjectural readings—the middle one—is actually found in the Sinaitic manuscript (ℵ), and thence it has actually been introduced into the evangelist's text by Tischendorf, in the 8th edition of his New Testament. It is a marvellous deference to pay to the fine Old Manuscript. It is far too much, however. The writer of the manuscript had manifestly been puzzled by the term which he found in the text from which he copied, and, being unable to understand it, he assumed that it was a mistake, and corrected it accordingly. *If the debatable word was not in the evangelist's autograph, it is inconceivable that any transcriber would ever have inserted it.* And when we dip into the matter a little farther, we may easily see that the reading of the Sinaitic manuscript, if interpreted according to the rendering of the Vulgate (*oft,* not *much,*) could never have been the original reading. There is not an atom of evidence that either the Jews in general, or the Pharisees in particular, or any peoples or persons or person, ever made it a matter of conscience, or a matter of practice, *to wash the hands 'frequently' before partaking of food.* What then? There remains the interpretation of the Syriac-Peshito version. It renders the debatable word adverbially by a term which means *carefully* or *diligently.* It is the same term which is employed in its translation of Luke xv, 8. And, assuredly, if the debatable word can bear such an interpretation, all the exegetical exigencies of the case would seem to be met to a nicety. One should suppose that a perfunctory washing of the hands would not have satisfied the Pharisaic sticklers for fulness and thoroughness in all that was merely outward in religion. On the principle which led them "to make broad their phylacteries, and to enlarge the borders of their garments" (Matt. xxiii, 5); they would be careful to give, in all ordinary circumstances, an ample lustration to their hands, however neglectful they might be of their hearts. But it is scarcely likely,—notwithstanding their devotion to pettinesses, that they would insist on the cleansing being uniformly performed in one invariable way. It is not likely, at all

tradition of the elders. 4 And *when they come* from the

---

events, that the whole people would be particular in insisting, or admitting, that, from among the many possible modes of cleansing the hands with water, only one single and singular way should be legitimate. And hence the generic idea of *diligently* or *carefully* seems to meet all the requirements of the case. It is true that the debatable word does not occur elsewhere with this adverbial acceptation. Hence the difficulty. But it is nevertheless, when intrinsically considered, quite a natural acceptation, which may readily enough have obtained a local or provincial currency, although it never found its way up into classical usage, or polite literary phraseology. Just as some people speak of doing a thing *with tooth and nail*, when they refer to an effort in which the eagerness of a vicious temper plays an important part; so people in other circles might be accustomed to speak of doing a thing *with the fist*, when the thing had to be done *energetically, vigorously*, and *effectively*, almost *pugilistically*, as it were: that is Arias Montanus's word *(pugilatim.)* The washing was to be done as if hand were to contend with hand which should be cleanest. (Comp. *Suidas sub voce* πυξ.) Calvin gives, as one of his alternative translations, *à force.* Sharpe, in his translation, uses the admirable word *thoroughly.* Piscator, in his, has *diligently (fleissig);* Count Zinzendorf, *very carefully (sehr sorgfältig).* The great Isaac Casaubon contended for this interpretation of the debatable word. *(Notæ* in loc.) It had evidently been accepted too by Epiphanius in the fourth century. *(See his Hæreses*, xv.) It has also been accepted by many others, as by Petter for instance, and a-Lapide, among the older expositors, and by Kuinol, Wordsworth, Alford, Rowlandson, among the more modern.——*Holding the tradition of the elders: holding*, that is *holding firmly*, or *holding fast* as the term is rendered in Matt. xxvi, 48; Heb. iv, 14; Rev. ii, 13, 25. The ceremonial washing of hands before eating was not an injunction, bearing upon it a written superscription of 'Thus saith the Lord.' It was a mere *tradition*, orally handed down, as was alleged by its patrons, from *the elders. These elders*, or *ancients*, were often represented as the contemporaries or immediate successors of Moses, and as persons therefore who might be expected to know the divine will in reference to duties not formally enjoined in the Scriptures.

Ver. 4. *And (when they come)*: This supplement, substantially, is found in the fine old Cambridge Manuscript (ὅταν ἔλθωσιν). In many copies of the "old Latin" there is another form of supplement, equally excellent, "when they return" *(redeuntes).*——*From the market*:—Or, more literally, *from market*,—where, in consequence of the crowding of the people, there would be the possibility and the risk of contracting ceremonial contamination. The *market* or *market-place* in the ancient Jewish towns and villages would correspond to the modern *bazaar* of the east. It was *the place of concourse*, and hence *the place of merchandise.* The idea of *concourse* is that which is suggested by the Greek term (ἀγορά); and certainly, if crowding is anywhere in the East, it is in the *mart* or *bazaar.* Man rubs on man, and has often to squeeze his way through. "The great bazaars, where the necessaries of life are sold, are also thorough-"fares," says Miss Whately, speaking of Cairo, "and in the middle of the day

market, except they wash, they eat not. And many other

"so noisy, and crowded, that it requires much skill on the part of the boy who "guides one's donkey, as well as considerable vigilance in oneself."—"A sea of "white and red turbans is in front, here and there interrupted by a huge "camel, towering above everybody, and apparently going to trample down some "half dozen in his progress, or by a long line of donkeys laden with dripping "skins of water, or great stones for building, loosely fastened with cord-netting, "and threatening to fall on the feet of the passengers; though, indeed, from "the density of the crowd, they do not seem to have any feet—only heads. "To penetrate the mass is a puzzling affair; but the young guide calls out, *To "the right! To the left!* incessantly adding plenty of hints to individuals,—*O "boy! O man! O lady! O camel driver!*"—"If wishing to be more particular, "he alludes to the article the person is carrying, thus, *O chickens, O oranges, "get out of the way!* and so by degrees one gets along." (*Ragged Life in Egypt*, pp. 19, 20.) In Cairo there are numerous bazaars. But in small places, where there is only one, *it naturally becomes the favourite resort and lounge of the entire male population.* Hence a large amount of personal contact with individuals, whose secret physical or ceremonial condition cannot be known, is unavoidable. It was possible, therefore, as the Pharisees argued, that ceremonial defilement might have been unwittingly contracted in the market. They exaggerated the divinely prescribed precautionary measures, referred to in Levit. xv, and other parts of "the Law," and fancied that they were giving the highest possible evidence of extraordinarily meritorious holiness when they bound themselves to use more frequent ablutions than Moses had enjoined.——*Except they wash they eat not*:—Literally, *except they have baptized themselves*, (ἐὰν μὴ βαπτίσωνται). The reference of the baptism is to *themselves*, not to *the articles purchased in the market*, as Krebs, Matthaei, Kuinol, Lange, and others suppose. But the real action denoted by the verb *baptized* has been much debated in "the baptismal controversy." There can be no doubt that the term, in its primary acceptation, denoted *dipping, merging, mersing, whelming.* This should never be disputed. But there should be as little doubt that the primary modal acceptation got merged out of consideration, when the term was *ritually employed among the Jews.* The idea of *purification* became then outstanding and overshadowing (John iii, 22, 25, 26), whatever the specific mode in which the purificatory act was effected. *In the case before us the immersion of the whole body in water was really an absolute impossibility.* We wonder that even Meyer contends for it. It would have involved a bath-room, or at least a sufficiently ample plunge-bath, in every house and cot in the land! It would have involved, too, a supply of water such as has never yet been in Palestine, during the present geological epoch! For the water that was once used for purifying would be ceremonially "unclean," and therefore unfit for further use by a second member of the household. And what then would become of the household when three or four or more required to baptize themselves? For the same reason, a common public bath in every village would have been an impossibility among the Jews. The use of it by a single individual would have rendered it "unclean" for all the rest of the population, until it was replenished afresh for each. And even then the vessel

things there be, which they have received to hold, *as* the

---

itself would, until purified, be ceremonially defiled in consequence of contact with the unclean person, (Numb. xix, 22). *There is no evidence of any kind that the Jews ever had any public baths, or could indeed have ever allowed them, for the removal of ceremonial uncleanness.* The *baptism* which "the Pharisees and *all* the Jews" performed, on every occasion of coming home from the market-place, or from any crowded place whatsoever in which they might have got entangled among a mass of miscellaneous individuals, *must* have been something else than "immersion." It would no doubt, in all ordinary cases, be effected by "sprinkling"—*the common mode of purification.* See Numb. viii, 7; xix, 13, 18, 19, 20; Ezek. xxxvi, 25; Heb. ix, 13; x, 22. Add to these passages Psalm li, 7, "purge me with *hyssop*"—the common instrument, apparently, of ceremonial "sprinkling."—It is a remarkable fact that in the two oldest and most important of all the existing manuscripts of the New Testament, the Sinaitic and the Vatican (ℵB), the expression before us is not, *except they have baptized themselves*, but *except they have sprinkled themselves* (ῥαντίσωνται). Volkmar accepts the word. It is not likely, however, that it exhibits the original reading; otherwise, it would never have got superseded. But it shows us decisively what was the opinion entertained by the writers of these manuscripts in reference to the mode of the ceremonial custom, which is referred to by the evangelist.—And it need not be a surprise to any, that a word, originally denoting a specific mode or form, should, in the course of time merge its reference to its own primary import. Nothing is more common in living language. To *manufacture*, for instance, originally meant *to make 'by the hand.'* But now a very large proportion of *manufactured articles* are no longer *'hand-made,'* but, on the contrary, and in contradistinction, are *made by machinery.* Originally, it was *vessels only with 'sails' that 'sailed.'* But now we constantly read and speak of the *sailing* of steam-boats, although, in many cases, they have actually no *sails* at all, and thus cannot "sail," in the primary acceptation of the term. Originally, it was at the sound or *'blast'* of the trumpet that heralds described the armorial ensigns of those who entered the tournament lists. It was thus—(compare the German *blasen*)—that they *blazoned.* Their description was *'blazed' abroad* over the whole assembled multitude. But now nothing in the world is done more quietly than the *blazoning* of coats-of-arms. And yet they continue to be *blazoned.* In fact "*coats*-of-arms," so called, are no longer *coats* at all. Just as the great majority of *spinsters* no longer *spin.* There are, too, other *hypocrites* besides those who are found on the boards of a theatre, though a *hypocrite* originally was *a stage-player who answered from under a mask.* So a *villain* was originally just a *villager.* A *pagan* was simply a *country-man.* A *heathen* was *(an individual of the) nations* (ἔθνη). A *scandal* was *a stick in a trap.* And to come back to the very word in dispute, the root-verb from which it springs,—though primarily meaning *to dip,*—came also to mean *to dye,* in whatsoever way the *dyeing* was effected. And, as a matter of philological fact, the word *baptize* itself is now by the great majority of the people who use it all the world over, employed to denote the performance of a purificatory rite, without the least atom of reference, *in 'their' use of it,* to its primary import of *immersion.* If the

washing of cups, and [3] pots, brasen vessels, and of [4] tables.

[3] Sextarius is about a pint and an half. [4] Or, *beds.*

---

term is *now* employed in this way, is it inconceivable that it should have been *formerly* thus employed? If not, is it inconceivable that we should have to push back the reference of the '*formerly*' to the very time of Mark himself? There is no good reason for doubting that the "six waterpots of stone, containing two or three firkins apiece," which were "set" in the house in Cana, "after the manner of the *purifying* of the Jews" (John ii, 6), furnish us with a fair representation of the kind of vessels that were generally employed among the Jews to contain the water of baptism. The members of the family, and their guests, would, in passing into the house, *lift* the bunch of hyssop, that would be lying conveniently,—fixed on the extremity of a distinct and appropriate handle,—and would dip it in the cleansing element and *sprinkle* their persons. The water, and the hyssop, *being untouched by the unclean*, continued clean, and would be available for all. Lightfoot and Wetstein err in supposing that the purification referred to by our Lord passed *on the hands* alone.———*And many other things there are which they received to hold fast*:—*Which they received*,—as authoritative ordinances traditionally handed down. They *received* them, *that they might hold them fast.* When the ordinances were enjoined on them by their Rabbis, the design was *that they might hold them fast.* (See Fritzsche.) But their reception of them was *a past thing*, (hence the aorist tense of the verb); and *they were now holding them fast.* The language is equivalent to this,—*there are many other things which they hold fast, having received them that they might hold them fast.*———The evangelist mentions as representative purifications, *baptisms of cups*:—that is, '*ceremonial*' *purifications of cups.* And such purifications being *ceremonial*, and for another purpose altogether than the removal of physical impurity, would be performed in such a way as not to endanger the ceremonial purity of the aggregate of purifying water. *It would, in other words, be performed by sprinkling.* See the remainder of the verse. The Greek word *baptisms* is preserved in the Vulgate version, and it is much better than the partially synonymous term *washings*, which Erasmus, Luther, and Beza introduced into their respective versions. Erasmus says that he "wondered" at the Vulgate version, "inasmuch as the reference is just to common washing" *(vulgaris lotio).* He entirely misapprehended, however, the nature of the case. The Saviour does not refer to *common washing.* He would never have objected to the literal cleansing of cups. Such cleansing *must be regarded* as in accordance with the will of God. It has, too, a moral significance and effect, as well as a physical propriety.———*Cups*:—that is, as the word means, *drinking vessels.*———*And pots*: These would be larger vessels than the ordinary *cups*,—vessels out of which the cups would be filled. *Potts* is the Geneva translation. Tyndale and Coverdale have *cruses;* Wycliffe, *cruetis.* The word employed (ξέστης) is properly a Latin word *(sextarius)*, though it was adopted both into the Greek and Hebrew languages *(Buxt. Lex. Tal. p.* 2,076). It etymologically signifies *a sixth*, and would denote *a jug* or *jar that held a sixth part of a congius. A congius* somewhat corresponded to the English gallon.———*And coppers*:—See chap. vi, 8. These copper vessels would probably correspond to the large copper caldrons

5 Then the Pharisees and scribes asked him, Why walk not thy disciples according to the tradition of the elders, but eat

that are still used in Syria for cooking food,—often being of a size that is apparently very disproportioned to the other articles that constitute the essential outfit of a domestic establishment.——*And tables*:-A mere guess of a translation,—arising apparently out of the difficulty of conceiving that *couches* would be ceremonially purified either *by washing* in general, or by *immersion* in particular. The difficulty of the supposition is obvious enough; for, if couches required to be immersed, when they were about to be used afresh, not only would a very large supply of water have been required, the couches themselves would have been rendered unfit for use, for who could comfortably or safely recline on couches soaked in water? Yet *couches*,—that is, in this connection, as Heumann explains it, *table-couches*,—and not *tables*, is the only possible interpretation of the evangelist's word (κλινῶν). In every other passage in which the term occurs, in the New Testament, it is translated *bed* in our Authorized Version. See Matt. ix, 2, 6; Mark iv, 21; vii, 30; Luke v, 18; xvii, 34, &c. The word, moreover, never has, in any Greek writer of any age, the meaning of *table*, or any other meaning than that of *couch* or *bed*. It must have been in despair that both Luther and Tyndale rendered it *tables*. They were followed by Coverdale and the Geneva Version. Wycliffe and the Rheims however—following the faithful Vulgate—have *beds*. Felbinger has *bed-steads*, Bengel, *table-couches*. The reference is, undoubtedly, to *table-couches*, or to what the Romans called *triclinia*,—the cushioned couches on which, at banquets, the guests *reclined* while eating. Such couches would of course be ceremonially purified only by sprinkling, for it is in vain for Dr. Carson to affirm that "there is no furniture in a house that could not be immersed," or to suppose "that the couches might be made to be taken to pieces, in order to their more convenient immersion." (*Baptism*, p. 451.) It is noteworthy that in both the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts (ℵB), as well as in LΔ and the Coptic Version, this phrase *and couches* is omitted altogether; and, in his eighth edition of the new Testament, Tischendorf has actually dropped it out of the text. Most unwarrantably, however. If the words had been wanting in the autograph of the evangelist, they would never have been arbitrarily added. The writers of the manuscripts mentioned, and of the Coptic Version, or the writers from whom they copied, had evidently felt the very difficulty that led Luther, Tyndale, Coverdale, and our Authorized Translators, to hazard, by guess, the word *tables*.

VER. 5. *Then the Pharisees and scribes questioned him*:-Instead of *then* it is simply *and* in ℵBDL, 1, 33, and in the Vulgate, Coptic, and Syriac-Peshito versions;—no doubt the correct reading. The *then* had been intruded by transcribers who did not understand the relation of the second verse to the first, and its consequent relation to the fifth. It had been intruded to give the construction the appearance of greater concinnity. (See on verse 2). The *and*—Mark's favourite conjunction—is restored by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford. It was advocated by Griesbach (*Com. Crit.* in v. 2).——*Why walk not thy disciples according to the tradition of the elders*:-*Walk not* (οὐ περιπατοῦσιν),—Life is thought of as a kind of perpetual motion. It is a constant *peripateticism*.

bread with unwashen hands? 6 He answered and said unto them, Well hath Esaias prophesied of you hypocrites, as it is written, [b] This people honoureth me with *their* lips, [b] Isa. 29. 13.

—*The tradition of the elders*:—The word rendered *tradition* properly means *the act of handing from one* (παράδοσις) or *of handing down* as it were. Here it refers to the object of the act, that is, *to the thing handed down*, the *ordinance* or *injunction* which is subindicated in the next clause. This injunction came, it was alleged, from *the elders* or *ancients*. It was not written, indeed, in the Book of the law. (See *Joseph. Ant.* xiii, 10, 6.) But it was handed on from generation to generation by word of mouth, and had emanated, it was contended, from those fathers of the Constitution who had been the assessors and friends of Moses, and thus, as was to be presumed, so near the fountain of inspiration as to know the mind of God.———*But eat with common hands the bread*:—With hands such as heathens have. With unsanctified hands. (See verse 2.)—*The bread*:—Note the article, and the consequent simplicity of the representation. *'The' bread which is before them.*

Ver. 6. *But he answered and said to them*:—Or, as it stands more briefly in the manuscripts ℵBLΔ, 33, and in some of the best old versions, *But he said to them.*———*Well did Isaiah prophesy concerning you the hypocrites*:—Note the *well*. The same word is ironically repeated in verse 9, and is rendered *full well*, —the rendering which it receives here in the version of Coverdale. If very literally translated, it would be *beautifully* (καλῶς). Luther admirably reproduced its import, *finely (wohl fein)*. The Saviour means that the words of Isaiah could not have been more apt and felicitous, if he had had really present before him, for the purpose of taking their portrait, those very Pharisees and scribes who were finding fault with the disciples.—Isaiah *prophesied*:—The reference is not simply, or distinctively, or principally, to *prediction*. When the prophets *prophesied*, they spoke *fore* God, and *from* God, and thus *for* God, whether it was to things past, present, or to come, that they referred. (See chap. vi, 4.) The waters that welled up within them came from depths that were deeper than their own thoughts. (See *Patritius* in loc.) The Saviour, then, as Calvin has judiciously remarked, does not mean that Isaiah was looking forward to the scribes and Pharisees of the New Testament age. He means, that the prophet's utterances depicted these scribes and Pharisees to perfection.—*Concerning you 'the' hypocrites*: The article indicates that their hypocrisy, in the judgement of the Lord, was something conspicuous.———*As it stands written*:—Such is Luther's habitual translation of the expression, which, with somewhat less exactitude perhaps, is rendered in our Authorized Version, *it is written*. In the first two issues of Luther's New Testament,—the issues of 1522,—the expression is frequently given as in our English version, *it is written*. In the 1524 edition, however, and its successors, the less exact rendering is superseded by the more exact. The phrase is literally, *it has been written*. (See Isai. xxix, 13.)———*This people honoureth me with the lips*:—Making, as Petter says, "outward show and profession of holiness and religion." When the prophet refers to *the lips*, he specifies a part for the whole. Jesus had in his eye the baptism of cups and the washing of hands, as well as the saying of prayers and the utterance of solemn tones. "The reason

but their heart is far from me. 7 Howbeit in vain do they worship me, teaching *for* doctrines the commandments of men. 8 For laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men, *as* the washing of pots and cups: and many other such like things ye do.

9 And he said unto them, Full well ye [5]reject

[5] Or, *frustrate.*

---

is," says Petter, "because the principal parts of outward worship are performed with mouth and lips."———*But their heart is far from me*:—"*By heart* understand," says Petter, "the inner-man, comprehending all the faculties and powers thereof." (See chaps. ii, 6, and vi, 52.) The expression rendered *is far* is idiomatic and emphatic in the original (πόρρω ἀπέχει). It primarily means *holdeth off afar*. The heart of the scribes and Pharisees *held itself far off* from God. It kept itself to itself, instead of taking itself to God. Nothing, indeed, is farther away from God than selfishness, under whatever phase or guise it may appear.

VER. 7. *But in vain do they worship me*: (see *Patritius*, in loc.) The *but*, or *howbeit* of our Authorized Version, has retrospective reference to the more outstanding or obtrusive of the two preceding clauses, that namely in which it is said, "*this people honoureth me with the lips.*" Notwithstanding all this honour, *in vain do they worship me.* Why? See next clause.———*Teaching (for) doctrines the commandments of men*: Very literally, *teaching teachings, men's commandments.* It is, as Calvin remarks, a case of *apposition.* Tyndale's version brings out clearly the prophet's idea, though somewhat paraphrastically, *teachinge doctrynes which are nothing but the commandements of men.* The *for* of our Authorized Version, borrowed from the Geneva, and found too in Calvin's French version *(pour)*, is not altogether a happy supplement. It is liable to be misunderstood, and has been mistaken by many, as by Petter for instance, who explains the expression thus, *instead of true and sound doctrines.*

VER. 8. The quotation is ended, and the Saviour now speaks out of his own fulness. *For*:—This conjunction is omitted by the manuscripts ℵBLΔ, and the Coptic, Armenian, and Æthiopic versions. Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford leave it out. Rightly.———*Having laid aside the commandment of God, ye hold fast the tradition of men*:—The words *commandment* and *tradition* are used in the singular number, because the mind of the Saviour was concentrated upon single illustrative cases,—the commandment of God, on the one hand, *to honour our parents*, and the tradition of men on the other, *to baptize the person and its surroundings before eating.* The verb rendered *laid aside*, means etymologically *sent off*; but in the New Testament it is very frequently and appropriately translated *left* or *forsaken.* Such might be its translation here. ———*Baptisms of pots and cups; and many other such like things ye do*:—These clauses are omitted altogether by Tischendorf in his 8th edition. They are inclosed within brackets by Tregelles, and Lachmann (in his small edition). Alford brackets them too, but pronounces, on the whole, in their favour. They are wanting in ℵBLΔ, 1, and the Coptic version, and in all the manuscripts of the Armenian version, though not in Uscan's edition. We wait for further light.

VER. 9. *And he said to them*:—This is one of Mark's favourite ways of intro-

the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition. 10 For Moses [c]said, Honour thy father and thy mother; and, [d]Whoso curseth father or mother, let him die the death. 11 But ye say, If a man shall say to his father or mother, *It is*

[c] Ex. 20. 12. Deut. 5. 16.
[d] Ex. 21. 17. Lev. 20. 9.

---

ducing a new topic of discourse, or some salient detail. Compare chap. iv, 9, 13, 24, 26, 30, 40.———*Full well*:—or *finely*, as Luther has it. (See on verse 6.) Coverdale has *how goodly*. The first Geneva, *verie wel*. It is *beautifully* in the original. Though there is no need of making much of it, yet there is, undoubtedly, as Euthymius Zigabenus remarked of old, a dash of irony in the employment of the word. Castellio, Beza, Petter, Baxter, Alexander, all allow the ironical import. Willes too contends for it. "By *full well*," says Richard Baxter, "is meant *full ill*." "He speaketh one thing in words," says Petter, "and intendeth the contrary." Wakefield evaporates the life from the phraseology, when he tries to merge the irony, and renders the clause thus, "Ye *entirely* set aside the commandment of God."———*Ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your tradition*: Instead of *reject*—the Geneva word, it is *frustrate* in the margin, the Rheims word. Neither rendering is perfect. Tyndale's first rendering (in 1526) was, *ye putt awaye*: his last (in 1534) was a little stronger, *ye cast aside*;—neither of them perfect either. The word (ἀθετεῖτε) has no absolute synonym in English. It lies somewhere between *nullify* and *abrogate*. Petter explains it, "Ye abrogate or make of no force or authority." The word in the next clause, excellently translated *keep* in our Authorized Version, is also excellently translated *maintain* by Tyndale and Coverdale.

Ver. 10. *For Moses said, Honour thy father and thy mother, and, whoso curseth father or mother, let him die the death*: This last expression is antiquated, and somewhat awkward. It has not the merit, moreover, of being a literal translation of the original expression (θανάτῳ τελευτάτω). The Rheims rendering is Hebraistic, *dying let him die*. Tyndale's version is finely idiomatic, *let him die for it*. The original idea is, *let him finish (his career) by death (judicially inflicted)*. It was Coverdale who introduced the translation which is given in our Authorized Version, and the Geneva, and "the Great Bible."—The Old Testament passages quoted are found in Exod. xx, 12; Deut. v, 16; and Exod. xxi, 17; Lev. xx, 9.

Ver. 11. *But ye say, If a man should say to the father or the mother, Corban! (that is to say, 'A gift')*: It is the evangelist who parenthetically interjects the interpretation of the Hebrew word *Corban*. Josephus employs, interpretatively, the same Greek term. (*Ant.* iv, 4. 4; *C. Apion.* i, 22.) The Hebrew word means *a Gift (to God) a sacrificial gift*, (δῶρον θεοῦ, *Joseph. C. Ap.* i, 22). It occurs frequently in the Old Testament, and is translated in our Authorized Version either *offering* or *oblation*. It etymologically means *what is brought near* (viz., *to God*). When an unnatural son wished, either in a temporary fit of passion, or under the goad of an abiding selfishness, to get quit of the importunity of a destitute father or mother, he had just to say, in reference to whatever was craved, *Corban!*—or, as it was sometimes veilingly corrupted *Conam!*—and then not only was he released from obligation to assist his

Corban, that is to say, a [e] gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me; *he shall be free.* 12 And

[e] Mat. 15. 5. Mat. 23. 18.

needy parent, he was actually bound, as by the highest solemnity, to withhold the desired relief. So tortuously and tamperingly did the Rabbis deal with the word of God and with the consciences of men.——*Whatsoever it is by which thou mightest be benefited out of me*: This was the most sweeping and thoroughly generic way of expressing the cruelty of selfish rage, or of putting an end, inhumanly, to importunity. It continued among the Jews for centuries after our Saviour's death. It crops out again and again in the tract *Nedarim*, in the Mishna, as a form of "cursing" that was actually in use. Josephus speaks of the single word "*Corban*," being used as an "oath" or "curse" (ὅρκος. *C. Apion.* i, 22). But when that single word got appended to it, as the area of the radiation of its influence, the generic statement, *whatsoever it is by which thou mightest be benefited out of me*, the "curse" was embittered and intensified to the utmost degree. Often, we may suppose, would there be something less in actual life than the fulness of this sweep. The wide extent of the ban would be disintegrated or minced down, to meet particular details of application. If, perchance, a needy father should ask a sheep out of the son's flock, he might be answered, *Corban!* that is, *Corban the sheep!* or *Let be Corban the sheep!* If he asked a measure of corn, he might receive for answer, *Corban!* that is, *Let the corn be Corban!* (See *L. Cappel's Diatriba*, §. 9.) But if reproach ensued, and passion got towering, then the ban of Corban would be laid on everything that might be available.—*Corban! whatever it is by which thou mightest be benefited out of me!* And the Rabbis ruled that if an inhuman son thus "cursed" his needy father, he was bound to stand to his "curse," because of the holy word *Corban* which he had uttered. "O most abominable and detestable imposture!" exclaims Faber Stapulensis. And the climax of the satanic quirk was this,—the heartless wretch, though vocally vowing, by the word *Corban*, all his sheep and corn and other possessions to the Temple, *was not bound after all to give them to the Temple. He was only bound,—until such time as by some other quirk he could get absolution, —to give nothing to the person to whom he had uttered the sacred word!* (See *Comment.* on Matt. xv, 5.) This was a refinement of rabbinical jesuitism in "cursing" that has never been exceeded in the annals of the sleekest of human snakes. No wonder that it excited the indignation of our holy and loving Lord.——*(He shall be free)*:—A supplement thrown in by our translators, following in the wake of the Geneva and of Beza. It was devised in despair, because of the barrier that was found in the first word of the following verse. The natural apodosis, however, of the sentence is found in that verse.

Ver. 12. *And*:—This conjunction must, to all appearance, be omitted. It is left out by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles. It is wanting in the manuscripts ℵBD$\Delta$, 1, 69, and in the Coptic and Æthiopic versions. Its insertion in the other ancient authorities seems to have been occasioned by the difficulty of understanding the Hebraising expression employed, and the rabbinical jesuitism involved, in the phraseology of the preceding verse. "The words of that verse," says Petter, "are in themselves somewhat dark and difficult in the original Greek text, and learned men do not at all interpret them alike." (See

ye suffer him no more to do ought for his father or his mother; 13 making the word of God of none effect through your tradition, which ye have delivered: and many such like things do ye.

14 And [f] when he had called all the people *unto him,* he said unto them, [g] Hearken unto me every one *of you,* and understand: 15 There is

[f] Mat. 15. 10.
[g] Pro. 5. 1. Pro. 8. 6.

---

even Castellio and Dionysius à Ryckel.) With the omission of *and*, however, and the above interpretation of *Corban* and its adjunct, the connection of the two verses becomes simple and lucid. The *and* perplexed Principal Campbell; but he sagaciously concluded,—though he did not know that there was critical warrant for his idea,—that, somehow or other, it must be ignored.——*Ye suffer him no more to do ought for the father or the mother* :-*No more* or *no longer*, viz., after he has said *Corban!*—"*Ought*:"-or, by a still better spelling, *aught*, that is *a whit*. (Compare the Anglo-Saxon *aht, awiht, awyht.*) *Anything* is the translation of the Geneva version. The first Geneva (1557) had *oght*. Wycliffe has *ony thing*. The Anglo-Saxon, *œnig thing*.

Ver. 13. *Making the word of God of none effect* :-Depriving it of its authoritative force (ἀκυροῦντες),—*annulling* it, as it were. The word is rendered *disannul* in Gal. iii, 17. It occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, except in the passage of Matthew parallel to this (xv, 6).——*By your tradition which ye handed down* :-The Saviour identifies them, for the moment, with their forefathers,—*which 'ye' handed down*. (Compare Matt. xxiii, 35.) They and their forefathers were *one* in spirit.——*And many such like things ye do* :-The one instance of the Corban matter was but a specimen of many cases in which "the word of God" was racked, wrenched, tortured, and reversed, by the paltering conceits of the Rabbis.

Ver. 14. *And when he had called to him all the people* :-Or *the crowd* which was hanging about, but which, it would appear, had either spontaneously and respectfully retired to a little distance, or had been waived off by our Lord, while he had his interview—apparently at the dinner table (see ver. 2),—with the strangers from Jerusalem. The word (ὄχλος) translated *people*, means only *a miscellaneous collection of people, a crowd* or *throng*. It is frequently translated *multitude* in our Authorized Version, and sometimes *press* (Mark ii, 4; v, 30; Luke xix. 3), and sometimes *company* (Luke v, 29; vi, 17; xi, 27). The full expression in the Received Text is *all the crowd*. But instead of the adjective *all* (πάντα), there occurs in some of the highest authorities the adverb *again*, which, in Greek, bears some little analogy, in appearance, to the adjective (πάλιν). *And when he had called to him 'again' the crowd*. This reading was defended by Mill (*Prol.* §. 403), and, on the whole, approved of by Griesbach (see *Com. Crit*). It is introduced into the text by Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles. It is supported by the manuscripts ℵBDLΔ, and the Vulgate, Coptic, and Æthiopic versions, and the margin of the Philoxenian-Syriac.——*He said to them, Hear me, all, and understand* : This formality of introduction indicates that some principle of far-reaching importance was about to be enunciated.

Ver. 15. *There is nothing from without a man* :-It is *the man* in the original.

nothing from without a man, that entering into him can
defile him: but [h] the things which come out of him, [h] Prov. 23. 7.
those are they that defile the man. 16 [i] If any [i] Mat. 11. 15.
man have ears to hear, let him hear. Mark 4. 23. Rev. 2. 7.
17 And [j] when he was entered into the house from [j] Mat. 15. 15.

---

The Saviour is mentally individualizing a particular case, as a representative of all others,—*There is nothing outside 'the' man.*———*Entering into him*—or, as Tyndale has it, *when litt entereth in to hym*—*which is able to defile him*:-Literally, *to make him common*, like the unsanctified mass of mankind,—*to make him profane* (in the original meaning of that term),—*to make him unholy*. Had our Saviour been speaking as a physiologist, he would have admitted and contended that *many things from without*, if allowed to enter within, will corrupt the functions of physical life, and carry disorder and detriment into the whole fabric of the frame. But he was speaking as a moralist, and hence the antithetic statement of the next clause.———*But the things*—or, as Tyndale has it, *thoo thynges*—*which come out from him*:-Or, as it is in the texts of Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, *which come out from the man*. This repetition is the reading of the manuscripts ℵBDLΔ, 33, and the Vulgate, Gothic, Coptic, Ethiopic, and Persic versions.———*Those are they that defile the man*:-*That render the man common*. Tischendorf in his 8th edition omits the *those* under the authority of ℵBLΔ. It is a matter of no exegetical moment. The Saviour, speaking as a moralist, lays his hand on the fundamental spring of all that moral impurity, which is so *common* in the world. It originates in the *heart* of man's being, and thence wells out. It is not an import, but an export. Its origin is in self. Its genesis is in self-will. Nothing but what is the product of free-will can be sinful, or have guilt attaching to it. Nothing else is culpably excessive on the one hand, or culpably deficient on the other. Nothing else is culpably present, or culpably absent and wanting. Free-will is ever the *causing cause*, and never the merely *caused cause*, of all the human or diabolic effluences that corrupt the sum-total of moral being.

Ver. 16. *If any one have ears to hear, let him hear*: This verse is bracketed by Fritzsche, Tregelles, and Alford, as of doubtful authenticity. It was "vehemently *(vehementer)* suspected" by Mill (Prol. §. 1475). It was received by Lachmann; but it is omitted altogether by Tischendorf in his 8th edition. It is wanting in the manuscripts ℵBLΔ, and the Coptic version. It is rather more likely, however, that it would be accidentally omitted by certain transcribers than intentionally intruded. Comp. chap. iv, 9, 23.

Ver. 17. *And when he entered into the house*:-In the texts which were lying before our translators the expression was not "*the* house," but simply and anarthrously, *house*. Hence the Geneva translation, *into an house*, and the first version of Tyndale (1526) *into a housse*. Tyndale, in his second version (1534) has *to housse*. But Coverdale, the Great Bible, and the Rheims, as well as Luther, have *into 'the' house*. Strange to say, Tischendorf in his 8th edition, under the authority of the Sinaitic and San Gallensis manuscripts (ℵΔ), inserts the article. The authorization for the insertion is altogether insufficient. But we are not to suppose, on the other hand, that the

the people, his disciples asked him concerning the parable. 18 And he saith unto them, Are ye so without understanding also? Do ye not perceive, that whatsoever thing from without entereth into the man, *it* cannot defile him;

---

phrase exactly means *into 'a' house*. It is idiomatic, (comp. chap. ii, 1; iii, 1, 19); and if an article must in English be inserted, *the* is to be preferred. *Into the house*, that is, *into the house where he was lodging.*———*From the people*:-That is, as Tyndale gives it, *away from the people*, or *away from the crowd*. Perhaps it was sun-setting time, and our Saviour would enjoin on the people to retire to their homes. Having thus spoken to them, he would, as Petter expresses it, "leave the multitude, that he might be private for a time to refresh himself with his disciples."———*His disciples asked him concerning the parable*:-Or more literally and correctly, according to the reading of the modern critical editors,—approved of too by Griesbach and Fritzsche,—*His disciples asked him the parable*, that is, they asked its meaning. The word *parable*, as here used, goes back to its primary import. There was no *story* in the case. *Story* is not essential to the idea of a parable. It is an accident. The *parable* was *a side-throw*, in contradistinction to *a direct utterance*. Hence something was revealed, and something was at the same time concealed. (Chap. iii, 23.) The reference here is to the apophthegm contained in verse 15, which did not directly utter and unfold the whole truth of the case. It was, as the Germans would say, a *Denkspruch*, and needed to be unfolded. There was a husk around the kernel of its meaning. "His *disciples* asked him":—we learn from Matt. xv, 15, that it was Peter who was the spokesman; and Hilgenfeld imagines that, as the question led to a reproof, we have, in Mark's suppression of his name, an evidence of the Petrinism of the Gospel. (*Evangel.* p. 137.) It may be so. But it may also simply be that the evangelist, without any peculiar reference to Peter, just avails himself of the eclecticism which is at once the privilege and the necessity of all historians and biographers. It was a fact that the whole company of the disciples were in a state of mental perplexity. (See Matt. xv, 16.)

VER. 18. *And he says to them, Are ye so without understanding also?* Or, *Is it the case that even you are so dull in apprehension?-Even you*, who have so long been with me, and have hence had such opportunities of understanding the principles of right and wrong, of true and false.—*So dull in apprehension*:-Literally, *so unintelligent*:—only there is no reference to the generic capacity of intelligence. The reference is, specifically, to the application of the capacity to the subject in hand,—*Are ye in this matter so unintelligent?* Note the *so*,—*to such an extent as not to understand the apophthegm which I uttered to the collective crowd, and which I put into the form which it received, because I wished them to turn it over and over in their thoughts, till they should see through it.*———*Do ye not perceive that everything that entereth from without into the man is unable to defile him*: Or literally, *to make him common*, that is, *to make him, as regards moral condition, to be in the state which is 'common' all over the world*. The Saviour refers to the material things, that enter into a man through his mouth. His principle, however, is applicable, on a higher plane of reference, to spiritual things too which come in from without. These, however noxious, cannot of them-

19 because it entereth not into his heart, but [k]into the belly, and goeth out into the draught, purging all meats? 20 And he said, That which cometh out of the man, that defileth the man. 21 For [l]from within, out of [m]the

[k] 1 Cor. 6. 13.

[l] Prov. 23. 7.

[m] Jer. 17. 9.

---

selves defile a man. "The man within the breast" must act in reference to them before guilt can be contracted.

VER. 19. *Because it entereth not into the heart*:—The spiritual region of the being, the region in which alone can be found the entities and essences of moral purity and impurity. "By *heart*," says Petter, "understand *the whole inner man*, comprehending in a large sense the principal faculties of the soul." ———*But into the belly*:—The merely corporeal region,—the region of the stomach and those other wonderful intestinal structures which have to do with the 'chymification,' 'chylification,' and 'sanguification' of the food, and thus with the utilization of its nourishing ingredients.———*And goeth out into the draught*:—The place whence refuse is withdrawn.———*Purifying all the meats*: That is, *all the 'comestibles' that have been eaten*. The word *purifying* has been puzzling from time immemorial; and hence multitudes of the manuscripts turned its gender from a masculine (καθαρίζων) into a neuter (καθαρίζον). This neuter gender thus became the reading of the *Received Text*, and is defended by Griesbach. (*Com. Crit.*) But the word is masculine in almost all the most important authorities, such as ℵABEFGHLSΧΔ, 1, 69, and is so given in the texts of Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford. The construction is extremely inartificial. There is, indeed, take the words as we may, a grammatical *anacoluth*. But the expression must, apparently, refer to the *draught*, which, by receiving the refuse, draws off as it were the impurities of the food, or those elements that remain after the nutritive ingredients have been eliminated and assimilated.

VER. 20. *But he said*:—Turning to the other—the spiritual—side of this case. ———*That which cometh forth from the man*—and has been originated within him—*that defileth the man*: Namely, when he is defiled at all, or *made common*, as the phrase literally means, and as it is given in the Rheims version. The Saviour refers of course to a moral condition, for the scribes and Pharisees in his day had confounded what was ceremonial with what was moral. They were contending, blindly, pertinaciously, and pettifoggingly, for the variable letter, as if it were the immutable spirit. And not only did they insist on the everlasting permanence of the letter, they equally insisted on the rigid observance of all the little teazing tittles and jots of ritualistic righteousness, which had been gratuitously added to the Mosaic letter by the fertile ingenuity of small Rabbinical interpreters.

VER. 21. *For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed forth evil thoughts*:—Or rather *evil communications*, or *evil conversations*, or *evil disputings*. Still more literally *the evil disputings*,—those namely that were so common in Jewish society, and so infectious. The Saviour may have been referring to such rancorous disputes as had just been exhibited by the inquisitorial scribes and Pharisees in the uproar which they sought to raise in reference to the conduct of his disciples. The word is rendered *disputings* in Phil. ii, 14, and *reasoning*

heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, 22 thefts, [6]covetousness, wickedness, deceit,

[6] Gr. *covetousnesses, wickednesses.*

---

in Luke ix, 46. The cognate verb (διαλογίζομαι) is almost always rendered *to reason*, and, in Mark ix, 33, *to dispute*. It refers to some kind of *dialectical* exercise, inward or outward,—the bandying of a matter backward and forward with oneself or another. The reference here is not to what is inward, but to what is outward, as having welled up from what is inward.—*Out of the heart* :- That is, generically, *out of the inward or spiritual element of our nature*,—the inward or spiritual, as distinguished from the outward or corporeal. See verses 6, 19 ; chap. ii, 6, 8.———*Adulteries, fornications, murders* :-There is considerable difference in the manuscripts, and old versions, regarding the order of some of the words in this clause and in the succeeding verse. Hence Tischendorf and Tregelles put *fornications* first, then *thefts*, then *murders*, then *adulteries*. But manifestly there was no special principle of order intended. The terms were simply *showered down*.—Fritzsche says that the vices, which are miscellaneously specified, are considered "not in so far as they are *perpetrated*, but in so far as they are *meditated*." It is an infelicitous distinction ; for the specified vices are expressly referred to as coming out from within, and efflorescing into overt acts. They pass beyond intentions into accomplishments. There is, indeed, in the interior region of our being, sphere within sphere ; and intentions may be distinguished, not only from their consequents *ad extra*, but also from their antecedents *ab intra*. When thus distinguished, we find, in their antecedents, vices of choice that spring directly out of the innermost fountain of personality,—the heart of the heart. But it is not to these interrelationships *in the interior of the being*, that the Saviour here refers. He is drawing a broad distinction between what belongs to the inner or spiritual sphere (the *heart*) on the one hand, and what belongs to the outer or corporeal on the other.

Ver. 22. *Thefts, covetousness* : -It is *covetousnesses* in the margin. The word is plural in the original (πλεονεξίαι), but does not exactly correspond either to *covetousnesses* or to *covetousness*. It refers, like the preceding expressions, to overt conduct, rather than to inward disposition. It is translated *covetous practices* in 2 Peter ii, 14. That is, as nearly as may be, its meaning here ; and hence the plural number. The cognate verb originally denoted *to have more* (viz., *than one's proper share*). It thence naturally came to denote *the voluntary possession of an (illegitimate) overplus*—the *holding* of it. A kindred idea was, the *grasping at* it, and the *claiming* of it. It is translated *to defraud* in 2 Cor. vii, 2 ; 1 Thess. iv, 6 ; and *to overreach* in the margin of 2 Cor. ii, 11. It is something like *overreachings* that is meant here ; yet not exclusively *overreachings*, but also *overgraspings* and *overholdings*,—all *acts*, in short, *that manifest a determination or a desire to have more than one's legitimate share*. Wycliffe gives, as an alternative translation, or gloss, an admirable description of the vice —*overhard keppyng of goodis* (overhard keeping of goods). It is one of the subtlest of vices, and the well-spring of innumerable social and political corruptions and collisions. It has been the real cause of almost all the wars that have been waged between nations, as well as the prolific fount of the

lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness:

most irremediable of family feuds.——*Wickedness*: Or, as it is in the margin, *vice inness*. But the term, either in the singular or in the plural, is too generic on the one hand, and too subjective on the other. The evangelist's word means *knaveries* or *villanies*, objectively considered,—that is, *acts of knavery or villany* (πονηρία). *Knavery* originally denoted the rude and trickish conduct of a *servile lad*. The word *knave* meant *lad*. It is merely our English form of the German *Knabe*, "a boy." *Villany*, again, just means the gross, coarse, unprincipled conduct that was characteristic of the serfs, or servile labourers, who were attached to the *villas* or country-houses of landed proprietors. These poor neglected *villagers*, living in clumps of wretched booths, "bothies," cots, or hovels, were in general extremely uncultured, not only æsthetically, but morally. No one cared for their souls. No one cared for their minds. No wonder that they were often guilty of *villanies*, and that their wayward acts got enstamped upon them the name of *villanies*. The Greek word leads us back to the characteristic conduct of the same unfortunate toiling-and-moiling class. The root of the word (πόνος) means *labour, hard labour, drudgery, toil*. The word itself denotes, in the singular, *the action of a servile labourer*. When morally used, it denotes *the moral action of a servile labourer*. Hence, as used here in the plural, it denotes *villanies, rascalities, knaveries*.——*Deceit*:-This, and the remaining items of the miscellaneous Catalogue, or *Sündenregister* as Mehring would call it, are in the singular number. Petter spells the word *deceipt*, and explains it as meaning "fraud and guile." The English word literally means *the act of taking from*,—stealthily no doubt. (Lat. *decipio* = *de capio*.) The primary idea of the Greek word (δόλος) is not so certain. It is supposed to have meant *bait* (for fish). Homer thus uses it (Od. xii, 252). But whatever its primary reference, it came to denote *any cunning contrivance for catching or entrapping (persons)*, or *for getting an advantage over them*.—"Deceipt is practised," as in other ways, so in this, says Petter, "by using any kind of craft or cunning to cozen others of any part of the goods or substance which belongs to them."——*Lasciviousness*: An excellent translation, superior to that of Tyndale, Coverdale, and the Geneva version, *uncleanness*. Wycliffe has *unchastitie*, and Wakefield contends for that term. The Rheims has *impudicities*. Principal Campbell, *immodesty*. Wolf, Rosenmuller, Kuinöl, Rowlandson, think that the reference is, not to the wantonness of *lasciviousness*, but to the wantonness of *injuriousness*, "*masterfulness*," *insolence*, or *outrageousness*. Mace renders it *impudence*. But the immodest companionships of the term in such passages as Rom. xiii, 13; 2 Cor. xii, 21; Gal. v, 19, make it evident that our Translators have struck on the true idea.——*An evil eye*:-That is, apparently, and as Suicer concludes (*Thesaurus Ec.*, vol. ii, p. 534), and also Patritius, *an envious eye*,—*an eye*, that is to say, *which manifests a spirit of envy*. Comp. Matt. xx, 15. It is the opposite of *a good eye*, or, as it is rendered in our Authorized Version, *a bountiful eye*. Prov. xxii, 9 ("a man *good as regards eye* will be blessed"). The mind looks through the eye. So does the heart. Lanctantius beautifully compares the eyes to glazed windows—(*fenestras lucente vitro aut speculari lapide obductas*)—through which the mind beholds. "And therefore," adds he, "the mind and will are often discerned from the eyes." (*De Opificio*, §. 5.) Salvianus of Marseilles

23 all these evil things come from within, and defile the man.

uses the same comparison of *windows*, but adds that hence "all wicked desires enter into the heart through the eyes, as through their natural avenues." (*De Gubernatione Dei*, Lib. iii, §. 8.) Certainly the *occasions* of the desires often thus enter into the heart, as the mind looks out. But the Saviour unfolds, in the passage before us, a far profounder Moral Philosophy, when he says that the evil desires *arise in the heart*, and come looking out wistfully at the eyes.———*Blasphemy* :–The word, apparently, is not here used, as Luther supposed, in its highest reference,—its reference to God. Its companionship is with vices that have reference to men. The term and its cognates are frequently employed in this lower plane, and then it means *defamation, railing, reviling, calumny, slander, evil-speaking.* (See Matt. xxvii, 39 ; Mark xv, 29 ; Luke xxii, 65 ; xxiii, 39 ; Rom. iii, 8 ; xiv, 16 ; 1 Cor. iv, 13; x, 30; Eph. iv, 31 ; Col. iii, 8 ; 1 Tim. vi, 4 ; Tit. iii, 2 ; 1 Pet. iv, 4 ; 2 Pet. ii, 2 ; Jude 9.) It is rendered *evil-speaking* in Eph. iv, 31 ; and *railing* in 1 Tim. vi, 4. The Geneva renders it here *backbiting.*———*Pride* :–Or *haughtiness of demeanour*, reflecting itself downwardly in *lofty and disdainful bearing*,—such bearing as assumes a right to appear *conspicuous above others*, (ὑπερηφανία). It is the vice of those who, owing it to accident that they are high in the social pyramid, take it for granted that others should be their humble servants, or, if possible, their serfs. It is the vice, unhappily, of some others too.———*Foolishness* :–Or *senselessness* of demeanour. Some translators err in fixing on certain specific phases of senselessness. Mace fixes on *vanity*, Wakefield on *arrogancy*,—far off from the mark. Le Clerc has *intemperance !* Principal Campbell has *levity*. Patrizi wisely adheres to the generic notion of *foolishness*, but he unnecessarily narrows the word's scope when, like Fritzsche and Hammond, he confines the reference to *foolishness of speech*. Heumann, beyond all others, made the investigation of the word *a kind of hobby*,—for years. He took his stand on Luther's translation *unreasonableness* or *irrationality (Unvernunft)*, and thence, working inwardly, he saw in the term not only "the greatest of the vices—the mother of them all," but also the reason why all Roman Catholics and Jews and Mahommedans had not been converted from the error of their ways. *The church had not made use of 'reason' as it should.* This, however,—though by no means too wide or too deep a speculation in itself,—is certainly going entirely out of the way of the simple Moral Philosophy of our Saviour, in the passage before us.

Ver. 23. *All these evil things come forth from within* :–They have an inward origin, and are vomited forth from the crater of the heart or soul. But whence then their origin ? From 'self' no doubt. They are created, if one may so speak, within the selfhood. By what? A wrong question. 'Things' are created, but never create. By whom then ? By God ? It cannot be, for *moral evil*—as distinguished from *penal evil*, which is *moral good* (Amos iii, 6)—is opposition to the will of God. By whom then ? By the evil-doer himself. In a little sphere of things,—and as regards *acts*, though not as regards *substances* or *essences*,—men may be spoken of as creators. Men, that is to say, are the efficient causes of their own choices. If they were not, will would not be really free. If it was not, there would be no real responsibility.———*And*

24 [a] And from thence he arose, and went into [a] Mat. 15. 21.
the borders of Tyre and Sidon, and entered into an house,

---

*defile the men* :-They make him *common*, *profane*, *unclean*, or *foul*. They "defoulen" him, as Wycliffe has it. See on verses 2, 15, 18, 20.

VERSES 24—30 constitute a paragraph which gives us a glimpse into what was a kind of parenthesis in the life of our Saviour. See the corresponding paragraph in Matt. xv, 21—28.

VER. 24. *And from thence he arose, and went* : Or rather—to avoid the awkward position of the *thence* or *from thence*—*And he arose, and departed thence*. Such is Edgar Taylor's translation. Our Authorized Version, however, is a perfect parallel to the Syriac-Peshito version.—*Arose* : An artless statement of the natural antecedent of departure. Compare Gen xxxi, 13 ; 1 Sam. xxiii, 16 ; xxv, 1 ; Jon. i, 3 ; iii, 3.—*Thence* :-Namely from the district that was contiguous to the Sea of Tiberias. It is too stringent in Petter, Fritzsche, and Meyer, to insist that the reference must be to the specific locality of Gennesaret, at which the Saviour and his disciples had landed, on the subsidence of the storm that is referred to in chap. vi, 47—53. ———*Into the borders of Tyre and Sidon* :-Great Phœnician cities, that had been conspicuous for centuries as centres of commerce and opulence. Tischendorf and Alford, however, omit from their texts the words *and Sidon*. So does Fritzsche. Meyer and Ewald approve of the omission. Griesbach too inclined in the same direction, pronouncing the reading, that is characterized by the omission, as "not improbable." *(Com. Cr.* in loc.) And yet there is, comparatively, very little ancient authority for that reading. The words are found in the Sinaitic, Alexandrine, and Vatican manuscripts (ℵAB), and in all the rest of the uncials, with the exception of DLΔ. They are also found in almost all the cursive manuscripts, including 1 and 33 "the queen." They are found too in all the ancient versions, with the exception of some copies of the Old Latin. They are twice omitted, however, by Origen, in quotations, in his *Commentary on Matthew*. There is, then, but little ancient authority for the omission of the words. And assuredly they would not have been repudiated by any modern critics, had it not been for a probable reading in the 31st verse, "and again, departing *from the coasts of Tyre* he came *through Sidon* to the Sea of Galilee." That this other reading is correct, we cannot doubt ; and were the Received or Erasmian reading of verse 24 inconsistent with it, we should be obliged to accept the amputative reading of Fritzsche, Tischendorf, Ewald, Meyer, Alford. But there is no inconsistency between the two passages, the one as given in the Received Text, and the other as given in the Critical Texts. There is simply an inartificial freedom of composition, in the direction of *generic* representation in verse 24, and an equally inartificial *specific* representation in verse 31. Such was the judicious view taken of the subject by Mill *(Prol.* §. 404) ; and both Lachmann and Tregelles have done wisely in retaining the words *and Sidon* in verse 24, and giving the reading *through Sidon* in verse 31. Alford says indeed, that "there can be no possible reason given why *and Sidon* should have been omitted, had it formed part of the original text." But the desire to produce literal uniformity with the correct reading of verse 31 was, certainly, a "sufficient reason." The hand of some

and would have no man know *it:* but he °could not ° Mark 2. 1.
be hid. 25 For a *certain* woman, whose young daughter had
an unclean spirit, heard of him, and came and fell at his

---

"studious" person, as Mill remarks, is apparent in the tinkering.—By the expression, *the 'coasts' of Tyre and Sidon*, we are not to understand the sea-coasts of these maritime cities or states. The word in the original (ὅρια, *the right reading*) just means *boundaries, marches, frontiers.* And indeed our English word *coasts* meant originally just costal places, *territorial ribs* as it were, or *sides.* The compound word in the *Received Text* corresponds (μεθόρια), —meaning exactly *confines.* It is rendered *borders* by Tyndale and in the Geneva. The expression leaves it indeterminate whether our Lord was actually beyond the Galilean territory and within the landmarks of Phœnicia, or only on the marginal ground of Galilee that marched with the lands of Tyre and Sidon. It is likely that he would still be on Galilean soil. Comp. Matt. xv, 22. It is likely that his temporary home would be the abode of some trusty Galilean friend.———*And entered into an house* :–It was not of moment to the narrator to give particulars regarding the householder. His mind was hastening on to another set of particulars. In the Received Text the expression is *into 'the' house.* But, with the exception of the Cambridge (D), all the best manuscripts omit the article. So did Erasmus, Beza, and Bengel in their editions. The Peshito-Syriac has "into *'ane'* house," that is, *into a certain house, into 'an' house.*———*And wished no one to know* :–Or, as Tyndale gives it very literally, *and wolde that no man shuld have known.* He wished seclusion for a little, with his disciples. See chap. iii, 20 ; iv, 35 ; vi, 1, 31. Note the word *wished,* translated *would* in Tyndale and our Authorized Version. It is not so much *volition* or *purpose,* as *desire,* that is expressed.———Griesbach unnecessarily supposes that our Saviour went out of the way, to escape the machinations of the scribes and Pharisees who had come from Jerusalem. See verse 1.———*And he could not be hid* :–He could not remain *incognito.* His fame preceded him ; and his bearing and behaviour marked him off as a remarkable Personage. His "following" of disciples, moreover, would make concealment extremely difficult.

Ver. 25. *For a woman* :–Or, as Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Alford, read it, *But forthwith a woman* (ἀλλὰ εὐθύς). The reading is supported by the manuscripts ℵBLΔ, 33, and other ancient authorities, and is likely, as the more difficult, to be correct. The Saviour "was not able to escape observation, *but on the contrary, and immediately,* a woman came to him as a suppliant."———*Whose young daughter had an unclean spirit* : *Young* or *little daughter.* See chap. v, 23. The word is a beautiful diminutive in the original (θυγάτριον), which the Germans can finely reproduce, as Luther has done (*Töchterlein*). Count Zinzendorf has a corresponding diminutive (*Töchtergen*). As to *unclean spirits,* see on chap. i, 23, 32.———*Having heard concerning him* :–That is, having heard that the great Israelitish Deliverer, whose fame had been ringing so loud and so long far and near, had come to her own neighbourhood.———*Came and fell at his feet* :–Instead of *came,* Tischendorf, in his 8th edition, reads *entered.* The reading is supported by the manuscripts ℵLΔ and the Vulgate and Coptic versions. And one could suppose that it had been modi-

feet. 26 The woman was a [7]Greek, a [p]Syrophenician by nation; and she besought him that he would cast forth the devil out of her daughter. 27 But Jesus said unto her, [q]Let the children first be filled: for it is

[7] Or, *Gentile.*
[p] Mat. 15. 22.
[q] Mat. 10. 5, 6. Rom. 15. 8.

---

fied into the Received Reading by a desire to bring the narrative into minute harmony with the narrative of Matthew xv, 22, 23. In reading Matthew's narrative, we naturally think of our Saviour as walking in the open air, at the time when he was addressed by the woman. But, on the other hand, it is possible that the reading of Tischendorf (εἰσελθοῦσα for ἐλθοῦσα) may have been simply moulded, by some semi-"studious" transcriber, on the expression of the preceding verse, *entered into a house* (εἰσελθών). Whichsoever be the correct reading, there is ample scope left for filling up the minute and unessential details of the scene. The interview, for instance, *may have been lengthened;* and our Saviour, during it, may have been both within and without the house. — *Fell at his feet*:-The preposition (πρός) indicates that she threw herself *toward his feet*, imploringly, and no doubt with beautiful oriental facility and gracefulness.

VER. 26. *But (δέ) the woman was a Greek*: That is, *a Gentile*,—an instance of the specific being put for the generic. Compare Rom. i, 16. It was on a corresponding principle that, in former times, Europeans in general were designated *Franks* by the Turks, Arabs, and other inhabitants of the south-western portion of Asia. The designation continues even yet to a partial extent. The Vulgate renders the term *Gentile*, and hence Wycliffe has *heathen*,—*Sothli the womman was hethene.* Fritzsche translates the word *pagan*, and supposes that the reference is to the woman's religion. It is by no means obtrusively so, but constitutes rather the first indefinite step toward a more precise specification of her ethnological position.———*A Syrophœnician by nation*:-Or, *by descent.* This was her precise ethnological position. She belonged to the *race*, or ethnological *family* (the γένος), of the Syrophœnicians. She was, as the Rheims version renders it, *a Syrophœnician born.* The *Syro*phœnicians were distinguished from the *Libo-* or *Libyo*-phœnicians in the North of Africa,—the *Carthagenians.* The Syrophœnicians were *Phœnicians* who dwelt *in Syria.* (See *Relandi Palaest.* pp. 50, 607.) They were called in their own tongue *Canaanites.* (See Matt. xv, 22.)———*And she besought him that he would cast out the demon from her daughter*: *Besought*, or *entreated* as the word is rendered in Phil. iv, 3, or *supplicated;* literally, *asked*, -the common rendering of the word. The *thing* that she asked was coincident with the *aim* that she had in view in asking; and hence the expression, if very literally rendered, would run as follows, *and she asked him 'in order that' he might cast out* (ἐκβάλῃ the right reading) *the demon.*

VER. 27. *And he said to her*:-Such is the simple reading of Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford.———*Let the children first be filled*: Or, *Permit that the children first be satisfied.* Let them first get enough. Purvey's revision of Wycliffe's version is graphic, *Suffre thou that the children be 'fulfilled' first.* The Lord would no doubt have previously told the suppliant that his mission was *a mission to the children of Israel.* (See Matt. xv, 24.) He could not

not meet to take the children's bread, and to cast *it* unto the dogs. 28 And she answered and said unto him, Yes, Lord: [r] yet the dogs under the table eat of the [r] Luke 2. 32.

Rom. 15. 9. Eph. 2. 13.

---

diffuse himself universally. He must select his sphere, and draw a circle. If all within that circle should welcome his ministry, they would soon be able to radiate out the influence to the ends of the earth. There was hope in the word "*first.*"———*For it is not meet*:–Or *good*, as the Vulgate and Wycliffe render it. Literally, *beautiful;* that is, here, *becoming.*———*To take the children's bread and to cast it to the dogs*:–In Palestine, and the surrounding districts, dogs abound; but they are not favourites with the people. "As the traveller," says J. G. Wood, "traverses the streets, he finds that all the dogs "are alike, and that all are gaunt, hungry, half-starved, savage, and cowardly: "more like wolves than dogs, and quite as ready as wolves to attack when "they fancy that they can do so with safety. They prowl about the streets in "great numbers, living, as they best can, on any scraps of food that they may "happen to find. They have no particular masters, and no particular homes. "Charitable persons will sometimes feed them, but will never make companions of them, feeling that the very contact of a dog would be a pollution. "They are certainly useful animals, for they act as scavengers, and will eat "almost any animal substance that comes in their way." (*Bible Animals*, p. 40.) There is, however, in the dog a deep instinct of yearning for human society; and the dogs of the East, though in general sadly neglected, and degenerated, have a chord in their nature that becomes readily responsive to human kindness. This has often been exemplified in the experience of European travellers. And there can be no doubt that in ancient times *children* and *little dogs* would get into terms of good fellowship. Not unlikely some specimen of such fellowship had been before the eyes of both our Saviour and the Syrophœnician woman just before the remark we are considering was made. The word rendered *dogs* is a diminutive,—*little dogs*, probably *little* because *young*. Tyndale renders it *whelppes*. So the Geneva.

Ver. 28. *But she answered and says to him, Yes, Lord*:–She acknowledges the justice of our Saviour's observation. She concedes the principle of action that was implied. She would not regard it as a fitting thing that the ministry which was so wisely intended for the Jews should be transferred to the Gentiles.———*Yet*:–an imperfect rendering of the expression that was before our translators, (καὶ γάρ). It is the same expression that occurs in Matt. xv. 27. But there is reason to believe that Mark's real phrase was only the conjunction *and* (καί). Such is the reading of both Tregelles and Tischendorf (in his 8th edition). It is the reading of the manuscripts ℵBHΔ, 33, and 69, and is supported by the Syriac-Peshito, Coptic, Armenian, and Æthiopic versions. The woman, as Trapp remarks, was "of an heroicall faith." She admitted the truth of the Saviour's principle, and then added what follows. ———*The dogs*—the little dogs—*under the table eat of the children's crumbs*:–The word for *crumbs* (ψιχία) is a diminutive, and means *little crumbs*. The reference is not to considerable pieces intentionally thrown to the little dogs, but to small inconsiderable crumbs which children are so apt to let fall

children's crumbs. 29 And he said unto her, *For *Mat. 8. 10,13.
this saying go thy way; the devil is gone out of thy daughter.
30 And when she was come to her house, she found the devil
gone out, and her daughter laid upon the bed.

---

ur lesignedly on the ground. The children, she as it were reasons, cannot, as a general rule, use up absolutely all the bread that is given to them. As they break and crumble their portions, there is some superfluity—however little—that falls. And the little dogs get the benefit of it. The woman means that, in her view of the case, it would not be inconsistent with the prerogatives of the Jews, that a poor Gentile in her position should get the advantage of the little superfluity of ministerial or mediatorial energy that was ready to drop, as it were, from the table, in the very fact of the Saviour's presence in that Gentile district. Such was the admirable reasoning, or, as Luther expresses it, the "comfortable dialectic" *(trostliche Dialektik)* of the Syrophœnician woman.

VER. 29. *And he said to her, For this saying*:—Or, *because of this saying.* (It is διά with the accusative.) The Saviour discovered in it the evidence of a faith that was at once peculiarly enlightened and peculiarly strong. It was therefore "rewardable." In scholastic language, it was a *cause* of reward or blessing. Something good could be conferred "*because* of it." It was not, of course, the *efficient cause* of the blessing. Jesus was that. It was only of a *motive* nature, *(causa motiva* and *impulsiva).* It was something that *moved* into action the Efficient Cause. And yet it was not the principal motive. The inward love or grace of the Efficient Cause was that. The woman's faith was the secondary and external motive of the Saviour's act, *(causa motiva externa).* Dr. Samuel Clarke's standpoint was not sufficiently elevated when he represented our Saviour as "*vanquished*, as it were, by the woman's modest importunity."———*Go thy way, the demon has gone out of thy daughter*:—The woman's faith was munificently "rewarded."—— —Volkmar wantonly thinks that the entire narrative is a cunningly devised New Testament counterpart to the Old Testament narrative concerning the widow of Sarepta (1 Kings xvii)! Hilgenfeld as wantonly thinks that Mark, by the word "first" (v. 27), intentionally "softens the strong, hard, judaizing view," that is given in Matt. xv, 24, 26, of the relation of Christ to the Jews! Ewald, Holtzmann, Michaelsen, follow another line of wanton conjecture, and think that, in the fuller account of Matthew, in which the conversation out of doors is narrated, we have the true remains of a passage in the Gospel of the Proto-Mark, which has been, for some reason or other, cut down and abbreviated by the Deutero-Mark! What next?

VER. 30. *And when she was come to her house*:—Or, more literally, *and when she 'went' to her house (ἀπελθοῦσα).* Very literally, *and when she 'departed' to her house* (ἀπελθοῦσα). The completion of her journey homeward is assumed.———*She found the demon gone out, and her daughter laid—or thrown—upon the bed*:—Such is the order of the clauses in the *Received Text.* The order is reversed in the texts of Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, —*She found her daughter laid —or thrown—on the bed, and the demon gone out.* For this latter arrangement there is the authority of the manuscripts ℵBDLΔ, 33, and of the Vulgate,

31 [t] And again, departing from the coasts of Tyre [t] Mat. 15. 29.
and Sidon, he came unto the sea of Galilee, through the

---

Peshito-Syriac, Jerusalem-Syriac, Coptic, Æthiopic, and Persic versions,—also of most of the Old Latin codices.———*She found her daughter*:–Or rather, *she found the 'child'* (τὸ παιδίον). Such is the reading of the chief manuscriptural authorities, ℵBLΔ, 33, as also of the Vulgate and most of the Old Latin codices *(puellam)*. When the evangelist says *she 'found,'* he intended the mind to go forward from the mere personality of the "child" to her condition as described in the words that follow.———*Laid on the bed*:–Exhausted no doubt and prostrate (chap. i, 26), but nevertheless enjoying delightful repose. She had probably been subjected to some severe convulsions.———*And the demon departed*:–The child was herself again.

Verses 31–37 form a paragraph, for which there is no parallel in the other Gospels. As it is wanting in Matthew, Hilgenfeld wantonly looks upon it as invented by Mark, or expanded, as it were, into specific form and details, out of the germinal generality of Matt. xv, 30.

Ver. 31. *And again*:–We must go forward with this *again* to the verb *he came*,—*he came again*, that is, *he returned*.———*Departing*:–The participle is in the aorist, and thus points to what was past in relation to our Lord's action in returning to the sea of Galilee,—*'after departing.'* (See Kruger's *Sprachlehre*, §. 53, 6, 6).———*From the coasts of Tyre and Sidon*:–The words *of Sidon*, as already intimated (v. 24), are omitted by the best textual critics,—Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford. They were suspected by Griesbach, and condemned by Mill. Fritzsche too omits them from his text; and Meyer approves. They are wanting in the Sinaitic, Vatican, and Cambridge manuscripts (ℵBD), as also in LΔ and 33 "the queen of the cursives." They are wanting too in the Old Latin version, and the Vulgate, Coptic, Jerusalem-Syriac, and Æthiopic versions. They are manifestly an import from verse 24. Our Lord had gone indeed to "the coasts of Tyre *and Sidon*," that is, to the boundary-lands of Galilee that marched with the maritime strip of land that belonged to Tyre and Sidon, or that constituted the territory of Tyre and Sidon. But, nevertheless, in going northward to these boundary-lands, he naturally came, first of all, to the neighbourhood of Tyre, which lay considerably south of Sidon. And it was there, as it would appear, that he met with the Syrophœnician woman.——— *He returned 'through Sidon' to the sea of Galilee*:–This phrase *through Sidon* is the reading of those manuscripts and versions which omit the words *and Sidon* in the preceding expression. There can be no doubt of the genuineness of the phrase. It would never have been invented by a transcriber, whether "studious" or careless; for as Sidon lies north of Tyre, it would never have occurred to any one that it was likely that *our Saviour would return from Tyre to the sea of Galilee by way of Sidon*. He did so, however; for he was still wishful to be, as much as possible, secluded. He needed rest; and so did his disciples. And they needed too to get education, and private preparation for the unexpected scenes of suffering that were so soon to throw into shadow,—as far as *their* vision was concerned,—the glorious personality and prospects of their Master. When it is said that he passed *through Sidon*, we need not be positive with Meyer that he actually traversed the streets of the city. He may, or he

midst of the coasts of Decapolis. 32 And they bring unto him one that was deaf, and had an impediment in his speech; and they beseech him to put his hand upon him. 33 And he took him [u] aside from the multitude, and put

[u] Mark 8. 23.

---

may not. Both Tyre and Sidon had boundary-lands. They were the centres of territorial semi-circles, which belonged to them, and thence took their denomination. These great cities, though peculiarly and emphatically cities, were also states. ——*Through the midst of the coasts of Decapolis*:-Our Lord, while having the sea of Galilee as his goal, did not take the shortest route to it from Sidon. He made a still farther detour, eastward, into the Grand Highland scenery of Palestine, and came down, somewhere on the east side of the Jordan, to the special scene of his ministerial activity. As to the word *coasts*, or *border-lands* see on verse 24. As to *Decapolis*, see on chapter v, 20.

VER. 32. *And they bring to him*: We know not at what part of his journey. ——*One who was deaf* (κωφόν): The word is two-sided in import. It often means *dumb*, just as it often means *deaf*. It is translated *dumb* in Matt. ix, 32, 33; xii, 22; xv, 30, 31; Luke xi, 14. It has the same meaning, and is translated *speechless*, in Luke i, 22. In Mark, however, it only means *deaf* as distinguished from *dumb*. See chap. ix, 25.——*And had an impediment in his speech* (καὶ μογιλάλον): He spoke *with difficulty*; and what he said would no doubt be awkwardly spoken. He was almost speechless, or, as it were, *dumb*. See verse 37. In the Vulgate the word is rendered *dumb* (*mutum*), which astonished Principal Campbell. He says "this deviation from the meaning is not authorized by a single manuscript." The Principal was under a kind of mistake. *The Vulgate word was intended to be a translation of the term in the text.* Luther gives it the same translation, (*stumm*). So does De Dieu, Ernesti, Ewald; Meyer too, who *contends* for the meaning; and Bisping, who simply *concedes* it. The term is certainly used in the Septuagint Version of Isai. xxxv, 6, to render a Hebrew word, which is always translated *dumb* in our Version. And in the Greek versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, the same term is employed in Exod. iv, 11, to render the same Hebrew word. One might say, indeed, of this Septuagint rendering, as Bloomfield says, that it is "erroneous," and thus object to the Vulgate Version of the expression before us. Or we may, more respectfully, and legitimately, presume that the Greek translators assumed that in the passages referred to the dumbness spoken of included, not only those cases in which it was absolute, but also those in which it was partial. There is certainly no good reason for supposing that in the case before us there was absolute dumbness. But Tyndale's version, on the other hand, understates the case,—"they brought unto him won that was deffe, *and stambred in his speche.*"——*And they beseech him to put his hand upon him*:-So as to heal him. They would seem to have understood that it was the ordinary practice of our Lord, to make a visible connection of himself with the recipient of his "virtue." The phrase rendered, *they beseech him 'to put,'* is literally, *they beseech him 'in order that he might put.'*

VER. 33. *And he took him aside from the crowd*:-*Aside* to a private place, most likely into a private house. Privacy is certainly suggested. (See verse 36.) The expression, indeed, rendered *aside* is not infrequently rendered

his fingers into his ears, and he [v]spit, and touched

[v] Mark 8. 23. John 9. 6.

*privately.* (Matt. xxiv, 3; Mark vi, 32; ix, 28; xiii, 3; Acts xxiii, 19; &c.) But why did the Saviour take the man (and his friends) *aside?* Michaelis suggests that the action might be a kind of parable to the eye. He supposes that the Saviour was in some heathen place, amid a heathen multitude. Might not his action, therefore, he concludes, be regarded as vocal with this idea,—*Ye must come out, and be separate, from your own people, from heathenism.* This, however, is too fanciful: and there is really no reason for assuming that the crowd was composed of heathens. Meyer is of opinion that the aim of the Saviour was to secure an isolated or undisturbed "rapport" between himself and the patient. It is likely, however, that our Saviour was just shunning,—under the influence of his personal feelings on the one hand, and his more impersonal judgement on the other, everything that might appear to be *display:* and more especially, when he took into account the peculiar mental condition of the crowd of Jews that was surging around him. That crowd was intensely excited indeed, in his favour. But its excitement was not taking the direction of things spiritual and heavenly. It was rolling strong and fast in the direction of things corporeal and terrestrial,—things that would be grateful to mere selfism and selfishness. The people were hoping, most likely, that they would be able to get, by means of the mystic power of such a Wonder-worker, social and political advantages that would free them from the necessity of toil, and exalt them above those Gentiles who had so long been domineering over them. (See John vi, 26—63; and compare Mark v, 37—43.)———*And put his fingers into his ears, and he spit, and touched his tongue;* (verse 34) *and looking up to heaven he sighed*:—Clauses these which have occasioned to many,—though unnecessarily,—very great perplexity. Dr. Adam Clarke, for instance, says, "This place is exceed-"ingly difficult. There is scarcely an action of our Lord's life but one can see "an *evident reason* for, except this." He would get quit of the difficulty by interpreting as follows,—"*and (the deaf man) put his fingers into his ears,* "intimating thereby to Christ that they were so stopped that he could not "hear; *and having spat out,* that there might be nothing remaining in his "mouth to offend the sight when Christ should look at his tongue, *he touched* "*his tongue*, showing to Christ that it was so bound that he could not speak: "*and he looked up to heaven*, as if to implore assistance from above; *and he* "*groaned*, being distressed because of his present affliction, and thus implored "relief,—for not being able to speak, he could only *groan* and *look up*, expressing "by these signs, as well as he could, his afflicted state, and the desire he "had to be relieved." Rodolphus Dickinson introduces Dr. Adam Clarke's interpretation into his version. It is inadmissible however; because it is strained and romantic on the one hand, and ungrammatical on the other. The construction is such that *the person who took* the man aside, must be *the person who put his fingers* into his ears, (ἀπολαβόμενος—ἔβαλεν). There is, moreover, no real difficulty. See what follows.———*And put his fingers*: Very literally, *and 'threw' his fingers,—thrust* them as it were, as if he would perforate or clear a passage for the sound to enter, (*quasi clausas et obturatas aures terebraturus*, —Maldonato). The action was of course symbolic or parabolic, but very

his tongue: 34 and looking up to heaven, he sighed, and

significant. It would be,—in default of words, which would have been unsuitable, because inaudible,—of especial significance to the deaf man himself.——*And he spit and touched his tongue*:—Or, as we might now express it, *and he touched his tongue with saliva*: Symbolically of course, or parabolically, but yet most significantly, more particularly in relation to the times, and the manners of the people; for, as W. Gilpin remarks, "we must not criticise the manners that prevailed two thousand years ago, by those of our own age." (*New Test.* in loc.) The man's tongue, we may suppose, would be hot, and stiff, and parched, and needing nature's lubrication. How was it to obtain its normal flexibility? By nothing in the man's own nature. By nothing that would be naturally medicinal. But by a higher power. It was to be by the fiat of Jesus. But Jesus could not tell the man this in words: the man was deaf. And hence our Saviour benevolently *acted* for his behoof,—intimating on the one hand, and no doubt with the utmost delicacy, that nature's own delightful lubrication would be immediately experienced in the affected part, and announcing, on the other, with the utmost significancy, that the blessed change would be the result of a fiat, to which there was nothing analogous in any ordinary medical treatment. As Maldonato expresses it, Christ's action was "a *metaphor*,—not in word, but in fact."—It is on this action of our Saviour, that Roman Catholics found their custom of touching with "spittle" the ears and nostrils of the person to be baptized, whether adult or infant. Thus, as Calvin says, "among other fooleries with which baptism has been debased by foolish men, the ceremony used by the Lord is turned into a piece of buffoonery." "Avaunt therefore," exclaims Cartwright, "with this profane spittle, as that which is fitter for the spital, than for the church." (*Confutation of the Rhemists*, in loc.)

VER. 34. *And looking up to the heaven he sighed*:—Or *groaned*, as the word is rendered in the Rheims, and in Romans viii, 23; 2 Corinthians v, 2, 4. Compare Acts vii, 34, and Romans viii, 26. Wycliffe has it, *he sorwide withynne*. Heinsius and le Cene misunderstood the term when they rendered it *he cried aloud*. Our Saviour was touched with a feeling of the man's infirmities; and perhaps, at the same moment, his spirit might take in, at a glance, the innumerable woes, both spiritual and physical, which have been rained down, with just retribution, upon men in consequence of their sins. It was *after looking up to heaven* that he groaned, (ἀναβλέψας—ἐστέναξεν, see Kruger's *Sprachlehre*, §. 53, 6, 6); for the deepest sympathy with man *springs out of* the loftiest communion with God. The lifting up of the desires—indicated by the lifting up of the eyes—is prayer. ——*And saith to him, Ephphatha, (that is, Be opened)*:—Or, *Be thou opened*, as both Wycliffe and the Rheims correctly give it. It is the man who is addressed. It was he who needed to be corporeally opened to the ingress of sounds and to the ready egress of words. The Aramaic imperative *Ethpathach*, or, in its abbreviated form, *Ethpach*, and the corresponding expressions in Greek and English, are applicable both to the organs of hearing, and to the organ of speech,—not strictly indeed to the tongue, but strictly to the mouth as a whole. Hence we read of Zacharias in Luke i, 64, "and *his mouth was opened* immediately, and *his tongue*

saith unto him, Ephphatha, that is, Be opened. 35 And straightway his ears were opened, and the string of his tongue was loosed, and he spake plain. 36 And he charged them that they should tell no man: but the more he charged them, so much the more a great deal they published *it*;

---

*(loosed)* and he spake, and praised God." There is no word for *loosed* in the original. The word *opened* stretches, as it were overshadowingly, beyond its appropriate object, *mouth*, and is freely applied to the *tongue*, in the manner called Zeugma by grammarians. In the passage before us there is somewhat of the same figure of speech, connecting the *mouth* with the *ears;* for in verse 35 there is no *explicit* reference to the *opening of the mouth.*

VER. 35. *And straightway his ears were opened*:—Very literally, *his hearings* (ἀκοαί). No doubt, originally, the *ear* was just the *hear.*———*And the string of his tongue was loosed*:—*String*, or *fetter*. *String* was Tyndale's word. Wycliffe and Coverdale have *bond;* and in all the other passages in which it occurs in the New Testament it is rendered *bond* in our Authorized Version, with the exception of Jude 6, where it is translated *chain*. The representation of the cure is, of course, popular, not scientific.———*And he spake plain*:—Or rather, *right* or *rightly*. The former is Coverdale's word, and the Rheims's too. The latter is Wycliffe's. The fact that the man now spoke *right*, seems to make it certain that he had not been, as Petter expresses it, "stark dumb before," or absolutely *a deaf-mute*, and that hence his infirmity had not been congenital. He had once heard well enough, and could speak well enough; but, either by some external accident, or by an internal disease, he had lost his hearing entirely, and could only utter, with awkwardness, a limited number of articulated sounds.———The word *straightway* or *immediately* in the first clause of the verse is omitted by Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford. It is wanting in ℵBDLΔ, 33, the Coptic Version, and several copies of the Old Latin. Tischendorf, however, restores it to the second clause of the verse, *and 'immediately' the bond of his tongue was loosed*, under the authority of ℵLΔ and the Æthiopic Version.

VER. 36. *And he charged them that they should tell no one*:—He gave them *distinct* and positive orders, (διεστείλατο). *Them*,—the man who had been cured, and his friends. The fact of the cure could not, indeed, be concealed from the outside crowd. But our Saviour wished that it should not be blazoned abroad. The rush of sight-seers, and of others who were either morbidly or superficially excited, was still most inconveniencing. It was with difficulty that the Saviour obtained that statedly recurring seclusion, of which his own human weakness stood in need, and which was urgently required by his disciples in order to their spiritual development and evangelistic education and preparation.———*But the more he charged them, so much the more exceedingly they published (it)*:—They probably did not understand the reason why he sought to restrain them, imagining perhaps that he was only giving expression to his modesty; and they felt so amazed and captivated that they could not hold their tongues. Popularity has thus its drawbacks as well as unpopularity.

37 and were beyond measure astonished, saying, He hath done all things well: he maketh both the deaf to hear, and the dumb to speak.

## CHAPTER VIII.

*Jesus, a second time, feeds miraculously a great multitude, who had followed him,* 1—9. *He went by boat to Dalmanutha,* 10. *Pharisees come to him, and, tempting him, ask a sign direct from the sky,* 11. *Jesus refuses and passes to the other side of the lake,* 12, 13. *On his way across he warns his disciples against the "leaven" of the Pharisees and of Herod,* 14, 15. *His disciples misunderstand his reference, and think that he is blaming them for neglecting to take with them a supply of bread,* 16. *Jesus is grieved at their obtuseness,* 17—21. *At Bethsaida he cures a blind man,* 22—26. *Then he passes northward to the neighbourhood of Cæsarea Philippi, where Peter confesses that he was "the Christ,"* 27—30. *He then forewarns his disciples of his coming sufferings and death,* 31. *Peter is shocked and began to rebuke him,* 32. *The Lord had therefore to rebuke Peter very*

---

VER. 37. *And they were beyond measure astonished, saying, He hath done all things well*:—*All things* namely that he has done. Principal Campbell errs in rendering the clause, *he doth everything well*. The generalized asseveration comes in the next clause.———*And* (*καί*): So, apparently, the conjunction should be rendered, rather than *both*, as in our Version, standing before the expression *the deaf*. It seems to be no part of the reported exclamations, but the evangelist's own link of connection between the two exclamations which he records. (Comp. chap. vi, 2.) Both Wycliffe and Tyndale render it *and*. Luther, Coverdale, Zinzendorf, Heumann, Bengel, and many others, omit it altogether; as does the Peshito-Syriac version, though not the Philoxenian. ———*He maketh the deaf to hear, and the dumb to speak*:—In the preceding exclamation the people had explicit reference to the particular actions which they had witnessed, and which were past and completed. In this they generalize their conception, and hence use the present verb representatively, instead of the perfect historically. Hence also, instead of using phrases that would have described to a nicety the special condition of the individual, who had been so marvellously cured, they enlarge their reference to "the dumb," in all stages of "dumbness," as well as to "the deaf."

## CHAPTER VIII.

VERSES 1—10 constitute a paragraph, which finds its exact parallel in Matt. xv, 32—39. The variations in the two accounts are minute. The exact verbal coincidences are many.

*sharply,* 33. *He candidly makes known to his disciples and the people at large that it would be necessary for all who would follow him, to take up their cross; but in the end they would obtain the crown; and he himself would, at the consummation, put it on their brows,* 33—38. *An instalment of this future glory would be given ere long, Chap. ix, 1.*

IN those days the multitude being very great, and having nothing to eat, [a] Jesus called his disciples *unto*

[a] Mat. 15. 32.

---

VER. 1. *In those days*:—The evangelist makes no attempt at very precise chronological representation. It would, therefore, be unfair to endeavour to work out of his narrative a rigidly consecutive concatenation of events. Such a rigid chronology was not needed; and Holtzmann proceeds on an entirely fallacious principle when he seeks to make out a close historical connection between what is narrated at the close of chapter vii, and what is recorded in verses 11—13 of this chapter viii, *and when*, consequently, *he fancies that he finds, in the interposition of verses 1—10, a disturbance (a Störung) of the real connection of occurrences.* (*Die Synopt. Evangelien*, p. 85.) He seeks what he had no right to seek, and what consequently he cannot find. Wilke before him made the same mistake. (*Der Urevangelist*, p. 567.)———*The multitude being very great*:-Or rather, *the crowd being very great*, or still more literally, *there being a very great crowd*, a crowd namely that had gathered round the Saviour while he was seeking seclusion in rural and comparatively unfrequented parts. Instead of *very great*—(παμπόλλου, *a word which occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, and not at all in the Septuagint*)—there is, in a large preponderance of the oldest and best manuscripts, a different reading, *again a great* (πάλιν πόλλου),—*there being again a great crowd.* This is the reading of ℵBDGLMNΔ, 1, 33, 69, as well as of the Vulgate, Coptic, Gothic, Armenian, and Æthiopic versions, and of almost all the copies of the Old Latin. The Alexandrine manuscript (A), on the other hand,—along with EFHKSUVW$^{d}$XΓΠ, and the Syriac versions,—supports the Received Reading. There had evidently been an early divergence in the manuscripts, and it is somewhat difficult to decide between the readings. Matthæi, Fritzsche, Meyer, plead for the Received Text. Mill, Griesbach, Lachmann, Tregelles, Alford, decide for the other. This other was given by Tischendorf in his first critical edition, that of 1849. But he reverted to the Received reading in his second critical edition, that of 1859. And now in his third critical edition, the 8th edition in all, he has gone back to his first preference. He is probably right, for although it would seem to be unlikely that a word, nowhere else found in the New Testament, would be intruded into the text, to the displacement of a natural and eminently appropriate phrase,—and this is what has to be said in favour of the judgement of Matthæi, Fritzsche, Meyer: yet, on the other hand, as an old ecclesiastical *Lection* began with this chapter, it may have appeared to some ecclesiastical Readers that the omission of the retrospective expression made the lesson more self-contained. Hence they might, with innocent intention, have substituted for the *again* the somewhat alliterative syllable by which they intensified the idea of *great.*

*him*, and saith unto them, 2 I have [b]compassion on the multitude, because they have now been with me three days, and have [c]nothing to eat: 3 and if I send them away fasting to their own houses, they will faint by

[b] Mark 1. 41.
[c] Psa. 145. 15.

---

———*And having nothing to eat*:—In the original there is a disintegration of the *singular* word *crowd* into its *plural* constituents,—the many individuals who composed it. *They* had nothing to eat.———*Jesus called his disciples unto him, and saith to them*:—In the correct reading—the reading given in all the chief authorities, and adopted into the text even by Scholz—the word *Jesus* does not occur. The reader is left to supply the pronoun *he*. But it was convenient, when commencing the public *Lection* in the church, to supply *Jesus*. Hence its occurrence in the Received Text.

Ver. 2. *I have compassion on the multitude*:—Or, as Wycliffe finely renders it, *I have 'rewthe' on the compenye of peple*. The word denotes such feelings, says Petter, "as are in natural fathers and mothers toward their children." ———*Because they have now been with me three days*: The expression, *they have been with me* (προσμένουσίν μοι), properly means, *they persist in remaining with me*. They persist in this although it was *now the third day*,—that is, the third day of their 'camp-meeting' as it were. The word, rendered *now* (ἤδη), means *by this time*:—*by this time it is three days*, that is, *by this time it is the third day*. The expression *three days* is exceedingly inartificial in the correct reading of the original (ἡμέραι τρεῖς, *not* ἡμέρας *as in the Received Text*). It has occasioned much perplexity to those who look for classic purity of diction in the Evangelist. Rowlandson proposes to construe the clause thus,—*there are already three days to them remaining with me*. Alexander, more violently still,—*three days now continue*. But there is no real difficulty. The entire phrase is an artlessly condensed conglomerate, and means, *because by this time it is the third day, and yet they persist in abiding with me*.———*And they have nothing to eat*:—Literally, *and they have not what they might eat*. Their stock of provisions was completely exhausted.

Ver. 3. *And if I should dismiss them to their homes*: Literally, and as Wycliffe renders it, *to their house*. The multitude is mentally disintegrated into the individuals composing it,—*each to his house*.———*They will faint in the way*: Or, *on the road*. Note the expression *they will faint*, instead of *they would faint*. The reader is led, as it were, to look upon the hypothetical standpoint of the preceding clause—*if I should dismiss*—as converted into a real standpoint. *The people 'are' dismissed*, let us say. What follows? *They 'will' faint in the way*.———*For divers of them came from far*:—Or rather, *And some of them have come from far*. It is Jesus who is reported by the evangelist as speaking these words. Some translators, however, have regarded them as a parenthetical observation of the evangelist himself. Luther for instance, and Heumann, and Zinzendorf. Apparently too Tyndale, and the editors of the Geneva Version, as also *our Authorized translators*. Webster-and-Wilkinson, indeed, refer to the primary edition of the Authorized Version, that of 1611, as reading *for divers of them 'come' from far*, instead of *for divers of them 'came' from far*. And this reading is actually found in the reprint contained in *Bagster's Hexapla*, from which, as we presume, Webster-and-

the way: for divers of them came from far. 4 And his disciples answered him, From [d]whence can a man [d] Mark 6. 36.
satisfy these *men* with bread here in the wilderness? 5 And he asked them, [e]How many loaves have ye? And [e] Mark 6. 38.
they said, Seven. 6 And he commanded the people to sit down on the ground: and he took the seven loaves, and gave thanks, and brake, and gave to his disciples to set before

---

Wilkinson must have quoted. But the *come* is a typographical error in the *Hexapla* for *came*. It is *came* in the primary edition. The exact translation, however, is neither '*came*,' nor *come*, but *have come*. But if *come* be used—as it is by Wakefield, Newcome, Bramehl, Godwin—it is evidence that the observation is ascribed not to the evangelist, but to the Saviour. That it should be ascribed to the Saviour is still further evidenced by the fact that instead of the initial conjunction *for*, it is *and* that is found in the very important manuscripts ℵBLΔ, 1, 33, and which has been introduced into the text by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford. No doubt, rightly. Instead of *have come* (ἥκασιν), the Vatican manuscript (B) and LΔ read *are* (εἰσίν), which Alford accepts. Tischendorf accepted the same reading in his 1849 and 1859 editions, but has now wisely returned to the reading of Lachmann.

VER. 4. *And his disciples answered him, Whence will any one be able to satisfy these with loaves in the desert?*–This last expression, *in the desert*, is literally *on (the) desert*. The people were *on the superficies*, as well as *within the circumference*, of the desert. The article is omitted idiomatically, just as we can say, in English, *on sea*, or *a-field*, that is, *on field*.—Some have wondered that the disciples should have brought forward a second time their former difficulty, (see chap. vi, 37). The wonder is unnecessary. The disciples' remark was just their respectfully semi-circuitous way of indicating how utterly impossible it would be to provide for the multitude by any ordinary means of purveyance. And it did not belong to them to lay down to their master the law of a miraculous commissariat.

VER. 5. *And he asked them, How many loaves have you? And they said, Seven*:–In Tyndale's spelling *loaves* is *loves*. Wycliffe has *looves*.

VER. 6. *And he commanded the people*:–Or, still more literally, *and he issued orders to the crowd*, or rather, *he issues orders*. Such is the reading of Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Altord. It is supported by the manuscripts ℵBDLΔ and Origen. The reader is transported back to the scene as it occurred, and looks on.———*To sit down on the ground*:–Or, *to recline on the earth*. The verb employed very literally means, not *to fall down* but *to fall up*; for, in assuming a recumbent posture, the body comes gradually in contact with the ground from below upwardly. The upper part is the last that comes to rest. ———*And he took the seven loaves, and, after giving thanks, he brake and gave to his disciples*:–The word *brake* is in the aorist tense (ἔκλασεν), whereas the word *gave* is in the imperfect (ἐδίδου). The evangelist might have put both in the aorist, but he chooses to bring into view *the continuity of giving* after *the act of breaking was past*.———*To set before them*:–Or, more literally, *that they might serve out*, or, still more literally, according to the evangelist's autographic reading as preserved in the manuscripts ℵBCLMΔ, 33, 69,—*that they might be serving*

*them;* and they did set *them* before the people. 7 And they had a few small fishes: and he [f] blessed, and commanded to set them also before *them*. 8 So they did eat, and were [g] filled: and they [h] took up of the broken *meat* that was left seven baskets. 9 And they that had eaten were about four thousand: and

[f] Mat. 14. 19. Mat. 26. 26. Mark 6. 41.
[g] Psa. 104. 28. Psa. 107. 9. Psa. 145. 16.
[h] 2 Ki. 4. 44.

---

*out*, (παρατιθῶσιν, imperfect, instead of παραθῶσι, aorist). The disciples were to act as *serving-men*. The word employed was the proper technical vocable, and meant primarily *to place beside*. In the particular case referred to, however, the food would not be *placed beside*, but *handed from the hand of the waiter to the hand of the receiver*.———*And they did set (them) before the people*: *They did serve out to the crowd*. Wycliffe's version is excellent, *and thei setten forth to the cumpany*.

VER. 7. *And they had a few small fishes*:–Dried, of course. See chapter vi, 38.———*And after blessing them he commanded to serve them out also*:–The precise reading of the original is not easily ascertained; but the variations are not of the least exegetical moment. It would appear that our Saviour offered up to his Father separate acts of thanksgiving for the bread and the fishes. Matthew represents them in the gross, (xv, 36). But there is nothing inconsistent in the two representations. The one is *involved*: the other is *explicit*. As to the meaning of the expression *blessing* when applied to food, see on chap. vi, 41. Zuingli correctly interprets it as here meaning *giving thanks*, (id est, *gratias egit*).

VER. 8. *And*—(*καὶ the right reading*)—*they ate and were satisfied*:–Literally, *were foddered*. Wycliffe's version is graphic, *fulfild* (that is, *filled full*). Tyndale has, *suffyced*: Coverdale, *satisfied*.———*And they took up of the broken meat that was left*:–This is Tyndale's version. Literally, it would run thus, *and they took up surpluses of fragments*, to the amount hereafter specified.———*Seven baskets*:–The word used for *baskets* (σπυρίς) is different from the term employed in the narrative of the corresponding miracle (chap. vi, 47, κόφινος). Matthew preserves the same distinction. The word here employed is supposed to have been of larger capacity than the other. It was the kind of vessel, in which Paul was let down over the wall of Damascus. (Acts ix, 25.) Principal Campbell renders it *maunds*,—too archaically.

VER. 9. *And they that had eaten were about four thousand*: Some very important manuscripts—such as the Sinaitic (ℵ), and the Vatican (B), and "the queen of the cursives" (33), and LΔ,—as also the Coptic Version, omit the expression *that had eaten*. It is a matter of no exegetical moment.———*And he sent them away*:–Or, as the Rheims Version has it, *and he dismissed them*.——The sceptical critics, in general, regard this whole narrative of the miraculous feeding of the Four Thousand as but the mythical echo of the corresponding narrative of the miraculous feeding of the five thousand (chap. vi, 35—45). The event is narrated, says Volkmar, "as if it were distinct from the other: but it is not." (*Die Evangelien*, p. 396.) Such is his, such is their, conjecture. But it is of course a mere conjecture and fancy. As a matter of act, the emergencies of human life often repeat themselves under only minute

he sent them away. 10 And [i] straightway he entered into a ship with his disciples, and came into the parts of Dalmanutha.

11 And [j] the Pharisees came forth, and began to

[i] Mat. 15. 39.

[j] Mat. 16. 1.

---

variations of circumstance; and it is nothing wonderful, therefore, that many of the miracles of our Lord should have had, in their relation to one another, some striking points of correspondence or similitude.

VER. 10. *And straightway he entered into a ship with his disciples*:—The expression *with his disciples*, says Scholten, in one of his morsels of criticism, is an addition to the original text of the evangelist. (*Het Oudste Ev.* p. 221.) There is not, however, the shadow of a shade of reason for the disintegrative conjecture. The phrase rendered *into a ship* is literally *into 'the' boat*. It was *'the' boat* which was regularly at the service of our Saviour. It could easily, on such a small lake as Gennesaret, be hailed from its mooring-place, when once it was known that the Saviour was at hand.——*And came into the parts of Dalmanutha*:—The expression *parts* is, in English and Latin, as well as Greek, used in a geographical acceptation. Territory everywhere is either naturally or artificially *parcelled* into *parts*. Dalmanutha is nowhere else referred to—so far as investigation has yet extended—either in Hebrew, Chaldee, Greek, or Roman writings. It must undoubtedly have been some obscure place, closely connected with another obscure place, *Magadan*, referred to by Matthew in the parallel passage (xv, 39). Augustin supposed that the one place must have borne the two names. (*De Consensu Evangelist.* ii, §. 106.) It is more likely, however, that Lightfoot is right when he supposes Dalmanutha to be "some particular place within the bounds" of the other. (*Chorographical Decad*, chap. v.) We know not in what part of the coast line of the Lake the two places were situated. Lightfoot thought that they were situated at the south-east extremity. Volkmar is of the same opinion in reference to Dalmanutha at least. (*Die Evangelien*, p. 399.) It seems probable, however, that the places were on the west side of the Lake. (See verse 13.) Baur has a singularly irreverent and wanton idea in reference to Mark's specification of Dalmanutha. He imagines that he designedly stuck in that name, to the exclusion of the place named by Matthew, "in order to give his narrative the *appearance* of independent origin" (*einen Schein von Selbstständigkeit zu geben.* Marcusevangelium, p. 61.) Holtzmann, on the other hand, reversing Baur's chronology of the inter-relationship of the Gospels, thinks that Matthew saw that Mark had made a geographical blunder in sending the Saviour and his disciples to the west of the Lake (*Dalmanutha = Damon*), and therefore changed his Dalmanutha into Magadan! (*Die Synopt. Ev.* p. 86.) Thus fancy fights with fancy. Each annihilates the other. Dr. Tristram,—assuming that Matthew's word was *Magdala*, instead of *Magadan*,—supposed that Dalmanutha may have been a little to the south of Mejdel, where there are "the ruins of a village, and some large and more ancient foundations of several copious fountains." (*The Land of Israel*, p. 429.)

VERSES 11—13 contain a little paragraph parallel to the paragraph in Matt. xvi, 1—4. The chronology and topography of the scene are left indeterminate in both Gospels; but there are more folds in the drapery

question with him, seeking of him a sign from heaven,

---

of the representation, as it occurs in Matthew, than are found in Mark's narration.

VER. 11. *And the Pharisees came forth*:—Whence, we cannot tell, and need not conjecture. "From their dwellings"—say Fritzsche and Meyer. It may be so. "They came forth from their concealment, like persons who had been lying in wait"—says Lange. It may be so, though there is nothing to justify the specific supposition. Lange gives, as an alternative view, "They came forth in solemn procession." Even this is a gratuitous intensification of the import of the phrase. The evangelist's expression, however, does seem to indicate that the meeting was not casual on the part of the Pharisees. They "came forth *of set purpose*," as Petter explains it.—Our evangelist makes mention only of the Pharisees. Matthew records that Sadducees were associated with them, (xvi, 1). The scene is thus described by the two evangelists from two standpoints of observation. In the one description there is a combination of more details than in the other. No doubt the Pharisees would be the predominant party, bustling about as usual with much self-consequence, and making themselves obtrusively conspicuous.———*And began to question him*: Mark notices the commencement of their onset,—*began*. The beginnings of things had a peculiar charm for him, and to note them—leaving the progress of events to the imagination—became *an idiom* in his mode of thought and speech. See chap. i, 45; iv, 1; v, 17, 20; vi, 2, 7, 34, 55.———*To question with him*: Or, as Purvey, Tyndale, Coverdale, the Great Bible, and the Geneva, render it, *to dispute with him*. Our translators would seem to have parted with this old translation under the idea that it implicated our Saviour in something undignified. A *disputation* in general requires two parties. Principal Campbell's version is *to argue with him*. The majority of modern English translators, however,—such as Mace, Worsley, Wakefield, Newcome, Norton, Edgar Taylor, Young, Brameld,—recur to the rendering of the old translators. Wynne mistakes the meaning. He renders the phrase, *to examine him*. It literally means *to inquire together with him*, (συνζητεῖν αὐτῷ). As originally employed, it denoted the co-operation of investigators. But as such co-operation became often replaced, in consequence of human infirmity, and the influence of partisanship,—by embittered disputation, the phrase, unhappily, shifted its applicability, and was used when there was nothing cordial or co-operative at all. Hence it came to mean, *to dispute with*. (See Acts vi, 9; xv, 2, 7; xxviii, 29; 1 Cor. i. 20.) In the case before us the disputatious spirit would be all on one side. See next verse.———*Seeking from him a sign from the heaven*: That is, *a token, from the sky, of his divine mission*. They intimated to him that they were not sure about the "ways and means" of the miracles he was working. There was scope, they insinuated, for illusion and delusion. Indeed, for aught that they could tell, Satan might have his hand in all these wonders! Let him, therefore, give them something more decisive. *Let us see something striking coming from a region where Satan can have no authority or power!* (Chap. iii, 22.) *Let us see something coming straight down from the clear blue sky,—say a shower of manna, which we could all handle deliberately, and eat* (John vi, 30, 31); *or*

[k] tempting him. 12 And he [l]sighed deeply in his spirit, and saith, Why doth this generation seek after

[k] Mat. 19. 3. Mat. 22. 18.

Mat. 22. 25. [l] Mark 7. 34.

*something else as unmistakeable.* It was a miracle of the nature of a phenomenal *curiosity*, that they pleaded for,—not considering that if such a "spectacular" exhibition had been made, they would have been the very first, and the loudest, to exclaim that it must be legerdemain, *for who could imagine that God was going to entertain them, like children in a theatre, with mere displays of the marvellous?* They were, in short, in a mood to find fault with everything that our Saviour should do, so long as he did not become like one of themselves. ———*Tempting him* :–that is, *trying him.* It will be impossible to understand *temptation* correctly, in the various branches of its signification, if this, the radical meaning, be let go. God is said *to tempt* (Heb. xi, 17; Gen. xxii, 1; Ps. cxxxix, 23). Christ is said *to tempt*, (John vi, 6). Men are said *to tempt*, (Mark xii, 15). Satan is said *to tempt*, (Mark i, 13). The point of coincidence in all these applications of the term is *trial.* All the agents specified *make trial.* It is the motive that determines whether the trial be good or bad. In the case before us, the motive was base, and therefore, the trial was bad. But it was not specifically, like Satan's temptations, *a trial to get our Lord to commit a sin.* It was a trial to get him to attempt something in which he might signally fail, something "spectacular," sensational, astounding, and coming from the sky. They hoped, by skilful playing on his weakness, to excite his vanity or his pride into rashness!

Ver. 12. *And he sighed deeply in his spirit* :–*He 'emitted' a groan from the depths of his spirit.* The word employed (ἀναστενάξας) properly means *groaned upwardly.* It is a graphic touch from the hand of an eye-and-ear-witness. ———*And saith, Why does this generation seek a sign* (ζητεῖ not ἐπιζητεῖ)?– He speaks to himself, as it were,—reflectively, bewailingly. In the next clause he speaks directly to his critics. *This generation* :–He does not refer exclusively to the critics, who were standing in his presence. His view had expanded, till it embraced the great body of the people. "The Jews require *a sign*" (1 Cor. i, 22). They demanded *a sign pure and simple*,—a sign that would be nothing but a mere abstracted prodigy, or feat of Divine power. But they had no right to insist on such a mode of evidence. It was a style of demonstration which was suitable in only very peculiar circumstances, (*see* Judges vi, 37—40; &c.), and which would have been quite unsuitable in the case of the contemporaries of our Lord. If it had been resorted to, theories of illusion would have been instantly propounded, or Satan would have been introduced to cut the knot. The testimony of the eye-witnesses would have been challenged. Demands would have been made for illimitable repetitions of the marvel, and for a thousand-and-one securities that no "glamour" was thrown over the eyes. Before any signs of the kind could have been advantageously given, a thorough moral preparation of the heart would have been requisite. A spirit of honest recipiency would have been indispensable. And then, why should there be abstracted, from the outgoings of the Divine energy, every element of mercy, humanity, and instruction? The works which our Lord actually performed bore ample and unmistakeable testimony concern-

a [m]sign? Verily I say unto you, There shall no sign [m] 1 Cor 1. 22.
be given unto this generation. 13 And he left them, and
entering into the ship again departed to the other side.
14 [n]Now *the disciples* had forgotten to take [n] Mat. 16. 5.

---

ing him (John v, 36; x, 25, 38; xiv, 11); and their testimony was far from being marred or diminished by the fact that,—instead of being wrought, as on the stage of a theatre, and in the manner of a master of legerdemain,—they were performed just as the natural emergencies of men's moral and physical condition cried aloud for merciful intervention. When God reveals himself in nature and providence, he utilizes the forces and resources of his being, making them subservient to other purposes than those of mere self-manifestation. And our divine Saviour, in like manner, went about "doing good,"—filling most divinely the recipient vessels of men whenever they were longingly held up, and rectifying in the morally self-conscious,—as far as was practicable amid the necessary limitations of time, space, and circumstances,—the disorders inward and outward that are the woful results of sin. Such works as these were the proper outgoings, manifestations, and signatures of divinity, in its moral relations to moral creatures in a condition of sin. They were really the very best conceivable of all possible "signs" (John ii, 11; Acts ii, 22). But as the elements of adaptation and moral utilization were inseparably inherent in them, they were rejected by the censorious and self-sufficient critics as being really irrelevant, and thus no signs at all,—that is, no sufficient signs. Our Saviour, for the moment, catches up the word *sign*, in the arbitrarily abstracted sense, abusively attached to it by his critics, and, in a kind of agony of spirit, because of the hopelessness of the moral condition indicated, says, "Why—O why—does this generation persist in seeking *a sign?*"———*Verily, I say unto you*:—Both in the word *verily* and in the expression *I say unto you*, there is emphasis given to the declaration that follows. (See on chap. iii, 28.)———*There shall no sign be given to this generation*: *No 'sign,'* in the extremely partial, narrow, and unwarrantable sense attached to the term by his critics. The phrase that is rendered, and correctly rendered, *there shall no sign be given*, is a peculiar elliptical expression in the original. It is literally *if there shall be given a sign*, and is, as Euthymius Zigabenus remarks, "an idiom of the Hebrew language." It is based on a certain form of *swearing*, that prevailed among the Jews. They were accustomed to imprecate some judgement of God on themselves, *if so and so were done by them*. Such imprecations were, of course, very strong denials or refusals. And hence there grew up—as a certain idiom of speech—the use of the hypothetical clause, *in a truncated form*, as a full and forcible denial or refusal. Comp. Heb. iii, 11.

VER. 13. *And he left them*: For there are limits to forbearance in dealing with creatures who abuse indefinitely the freedom of their will.———*And again embarking*, (πάλιν ἐμβάς): In the Received Text, and our Authorized Version, the phrase is *and entering into the ship again*; but the expression *into the ship* is rightly omitted in the texts of Tischendorf and Alford. It is wanting in ℵBCLΔ. Meyer approves of the omission.———*He departed to the other side*:—The eastern side, apparently, of the Lake of Gennesaret.

VERSES 14—21 constitute a parallel paragraph, in the main, to Matthew xvi,

bread, neither had they in the ship with them more than one loaf. 15 And he charged them, saying, Take heed, [o] beware of the [p] leaven of the Pharisees, and *of*

[o] Luke 12. 1.
Prov. 19. 27. [p] Ex. 12. 20. Mat. 13. 33. 1 Cor. 5. 6.

5—12. The representation is not so fully developed as in Matthew; but it has a touch or two that are peculiar to itself. Both the representations are but partial touchings of incidents and conversations, in which there would be many-sidedness of details.

Ver. 14. *And they forgot to take bread*:—*They*, that is the disciples, exclusive of the master,—for it would naturally devolve on them to make provision for the common physical wants of the company.—*They forgot*:—It escaped them (ἐπελάθοντο).—*To take bread*:—Literally, *loaves*.———*And they had but one loaf with them in the boat*:—This little fact, like the *groaning* mentioned in the 12th verse, is one of those minute incidents that are recorded by Mark alone. It had stuck in the memory of Mark's informant. And no wonder. The very existence of the single cake would help to throw into bolder relief the awkwardness of the disciples' neglect.

Ver. 15. *And*—in the course of his communications with them—*he charged them, saying, Take heed*:—Literally, *See*, and so Wycliffe renders it, *Se ye*. The Rheims has *Looke well*.———*Beware of*:—The Saviour thus gives, says Petter, "a double caveat or caution." The expression literally means *Look from*, but yet does not mean, as some have supposed, *avert the eyes from*. It is borrowed from scenes of danger. In the event of a formidable wild beast threatening an onset, it might be of moment for the imperilled individual, not indeed *to avert his eyes*, but yet *to look from*,—to look, that is to say, to the direction which it might be wise to take, in order to balk or escape the infuriated beast.———*The leaven of the Pharisees*:—That is, the doctrine or teaching of the Pharisees. See Matt. xvi, 12. Wycliffe's version is very picturesque, *the sourdowgh of Pharisees*. We are not indeed to assume that the name, thus metaphorically given to the Pharisaic teaching, was intended, of itself, to suggest depreciation. The word is not explained in Matt. xvi, 12 as meaning *corrupt teaching*, but simply as meaning *teaching*. Neither is it clear that the leaven, yeast, or "sour-dough," in use among the Jews, was regarded as a corrupting thing. But it was insinuative, penetrative, and permeative. (Comp. Matt. xiii, 33.) The teaching of the Pharisees, in reference to the expected Messiah, in particular, was to be suspected and avoided. They were altogether wrong in their general ideas regarding moral goodness and moral evil, and hence they were altogether astray in their specific ideas regarding the mission, character, and work of the Messiah.———*And the leaven of Herod*:—A clause that has occasioned to expositors unnecessary difficulty in relation to Matt. xvi, 6, in which there is reference to *the leaven of the Sadducees*, but none to *the leaven of Herod*. The two expressions are but two ways of putting one truth. The Saviour was not referring to the respective heads and particulars of the dogmatic creed of the Sadducees, any more than he was referring to the minute dogmatic items or details of the creed of the Pharisees. He was looking broadly at certain distinctive and outstanding principles of the sect. And in these principles, just as in the distinctive principles of the Pharisees, there was something far and fundamentally wrong.

the leaven of Herod. 16 And they reasoned among them-

---

They entirely misapprehended that which was the discriminative essence of moral goodness, and consequently that which was the discriminative essence of moral evil. Hence also they were in total error in reference to the character and work of the Messiah, who is promised in the Old Testament prophecies. They looked for a sovereign, who would be magnificent in his habits, powerful in his political influence, and either feared or respected by all surrounding potentates. It would appear that Herod had given himself out for such a sovereign,—sufficiently satisfying the prophetic descriptions of the Old Testament, when these descriptions were "liberally" interpreted. Herod developed into the Herod-family. The Herod-family were fulfilling, it would be argued by the "Herodians," the Messianic predictions. *They are fulfilling them in so far as it is reasonable that we should expect them to be fulfilled. Let us acknowledge it! Let us be content! Let us thus have "peace"—the burden of the songs of our Scriptures. In no other way shall we get prosperity. This no doubt is the real press of all the Old Testament poetry.* The Sadducees, as a whole, fell in with this Herodian policy. They temporised, (ἔλεγον ὅτι ὁ Ἡρῴδης ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστός. THEOPHYLACT). They eliminated from the mission, character, and work of the Messiah everything spiritual and sublime, and of course everything that had relation to propitiation for sin, and that was really needed as a *causa meritoria* for admission into the Kingdom of heaven and for the enjoyment of life everlasting. Thus there was a point of coincidence in the notions of the Pharisees, Sadducees, Herodians, and Herod himself. And no wonder, therefore, that our Lord was careful to say to his disciples, *Take heed, beware of the leaven of these people!* No wonder too that one evangelist makes mention of *the leaven of the Sadducees*, and another of *the leaven of Herod*.

VER. 16. *And they reasoned among themselves*: The expression means that *they conferred and disputed with one another*, viz., in reference to their Lord's injunction. (See Mark ix, 33.) *Disputed* is Cardinal Cajetan's word. They tossed the matter among themselves, *dialogue-wise* (chap. vii, 21), whisperingly perhaps, and with bated breath, yet eagerly and earnestly. ——*Saying, (It is) because we have not bread*: Or, *because we have not loaves*. The interlinking word *saying* is wanting in the three important ancient manuscripts, the Sinaitic (ℵ), the Vatican (B), and Cambridge (D). It is omitted from the text by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford. *But it must, at all events, be mentally supplied.* As the disciples talked and disputed with one another, the assertion came up again and again, "*because we have not loaves*;" and they surmised that the Master was indirectly reprehending them, *because they had not loaves. What else can he mean? How else should he speak of "leaven"? And yet, can it be that he is wishful that we should have nothing to do with any article that emanates from the hands of Pharisees and Herodians? Must we not —unless in the greatest emergency —make use of their bread or their leaven? It does not seem likely that this should be the Master's meaning. But if not, why should he choose this time, when we have neglected to take loaves with us, to warn us of the "leaven" of the Pharisees and Herod?* In the texts of Lachmann, Tregelles, Alford, we read *because 'they' have not loaves* (ἔχουσιν), instead of *because 'we' have not loaves* (ἔχομεν). This reading is grounded on the authority of the

selves, saying, *It is* because we have no bread. 17 And when Jesus knew *it*, he saith unto them, Why reason ye, because ye have no bread? [q]Perceive ye not yet, neither understand? Have ye your heart yet hardened? 18 [r]Having eyes, see ye not? and having ears, hear ye not? and do

[q] Mark 6. 52.

[r] John 9. 41.

---

Vatican manuscript, and a few cursives, and some copies of the Old Latin Version. A corresponding reading (εἶχαν) is found in the Cambridge manuscript. But the difficult reading of the Received Text, '*we*' *have not*, is overwhelmingly supported at once by the ancient manuscripts and by the ancient versions. *It must be the autographic reading*, –the others being mere conjectural efforts to bridge the break in the construction. What Prebendary Gilpin says of the evangelists in general, is particularly true of Mark,—"Their narratives are all artless in the greatest degree." They write, he adds, "with that simplicity, which men, big with their subject, but unversed in letters, might be expected to write." *(General Preface to Exposition of N. T.)* "Rhetoric *is artifice*, the work of man." (Cowper.)

VER. 17. *And when Jesus knew (it), he saith unto them*:–The phrase, *when Jesus knew (it)*, is a poor and imperfect translation of the original expression (γνούς), and is fitted to convey the idea that some time elapsed ere our Lord became cognisant of the perplexity of his disciples. No such idea, however, is conveyed by the evangelist's own expression; and hence Coverdale, true to the spirit of the original, translates the phrase, *and Jesus understode that*. The Rheims Version keeps nearer to the original idiom, *which Jesus knowing*. If our English idiom had permitted a praeterite participle, then a perfect translation would have been, *and Jesus 'knewing.'* The *knowing* is represented as *past*, before the following *saying* begins; but no hint is thrown out to the effect that some time elapsed *before the knowing began*.———*Why do ye dispute because ye have not loaves? Do ye not yet perceive, nor understand?*–How could you suppose that I was aiming, by a side-stroke, at your very pardonable oversight? I know well the many distractions to which you were exposed. It does not surprise me in the least, far less does it offend me, that it escaped you, on this particular occasion, to take with you a sufficient supply of loaves. But I am grieved to think that you should get perplexed on these matters, and that you should allow your minds to lie grovelling among them, while they should be soaring to the heights of great first-truths and eternal realities. ———*Have ye your heart yet hardened?*—The *yet* is wanting in the best manuscripts (ℵBCDLNΔ, 1, 33), and had no doubt been introduced from the margin. It occurs—but, as we should suppose, by typographical mistake –in the text of Tischendorf's 8th edition, *(see Note)*. It does not occur in Lachmann, Tregelles, Alford. The word *heart* is used in its common biblical acceptation, as denoting, not specifically *the seat of the affections*, but generically *the seat of the self-conscious principle*, or rather, *the self-conscious principle itself*. It thus simply means *the inner element of the complex nature*, or *the mind*. And the reference here is specially to the *intelligence;—Is it the case that spiritual ideas have still such a difficulty in penetrating into your thoughts?* See chapter vi, 52.

VERS. 18, 19. *Having eyes, do ye not see? Having ears, do ye not hear?*–

ye not [s] remember? 19 [t] When I brake the five loaves among five thousand, how many baskets full of fragments took ye up? They say unto him, [u] Twelve. 20 And [v] when the seven among four thousand, how many baskets full of fragments took ye up? And they said, [w] Seven. 21 And he said unto them, How is it that ye do not understand?

22 And he cometh to Bethsaida; and they bring a blind

[s] 2 Pet. 1. 12.
[t] Chap. 6. 41.
[u] Chap. 6. 43.
[v] Verse 6.
[w] Verse 8.

---

Although duly furnished with the appropriate organs of apprehension, is it the case that still you do not apprehend? Petter says that the Saviour "amplifieth their ignorance in *spiritual matters* by their contrary ability to conceive *earthly things*." He mistakes, however. The disciples are not blamed for failing to apprehend higher things, on the ground that they were qualified to apprehend lower and earthly things. The point of the reprehension is more reasonable. They had, by the gift of God, the powers that fitted them for apprehending the higher things; and yet they failed to exercise these powers as they should have done. (See Willes, *Specimen Hermeneut.* p. 104.)——*And do ye not remember when I broke the five loaves to the five thousand, and how many baskets full of fragments ye took up?* Such seems to be the artless connection of the clauses; and there is no need for trying to effect a very precise disentanglement of the construction. The *and*, before *how many baskets*, is found not only in the Sinaitic manuscript (ℵ), but also in CDMΔ, 1, 33 "the queen of the cursives." It is introduced into the text by Tischendorf. The Saviour asks, firstly, if they remembered *the time when he divided the five loaves to the five thousand*, and secondly, if they remembered how many baskets of fragments they then took up.——*They say to him, Twelve.* See chapter vi, 43. Instead of simply affirming that they remembered the whole wonderful reality, they state the number of the basketfuls which they took up; and thus they do more than acknowledge the fact of their remembrance.

VER. 20. *And when the seven to the four thousand*:–Tyndale repeats the verb in this clause, "*when 'I brake' vii amonge iiii M.*" Instead of *among*, it is *to* (εἰς), or *for*, in the original, both in this clause, and in the corresponding clause of the preceding verse. Norton has *for*. Young has *to*.——*How many basketfuls of fragments took ye up? And they say* (λέγουσιν the right reading), *Seven*:–Their memory was clear as to the facts, though their intelligence was confused as to the appropriate moral and Messianic principles, which they should deduce from the facts.

VER. 21. *And he said to them, How do ye not understand?*–How is it that you could think that I was afraid that we should be shut up to make use of the loaves, or literal leaven, of the Pharisees and Herodians? The reading of Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford is, *do ye not yet understand?* (οὔπω συνίετε;) It is supported by the manuscripts ℵCKLΔΠ, 1;—*Surely the light is, now at least, breaking through into your minds!*

VERSES 22—26 contain an incident which is recorded by Mark alone. Wilke contends however,—though in quite an arbitrary manner,—that Matthew must have been acquainted with Mark's narration. (*Urevangelist*, pp. 680 - 685.)

VER. 22. *And he cometh to Bethsaida*:–It is probable that the original expres-

man unto him, and besought him to touch him. 23 And he took the blind man by the hand, and led him out of the

---

sion was, not '*he' cometh*, but '*they' come, to Bethsaidan*. '*They' come* is not only found in a majority of the best old manuscripts. it is reproduced in a great majority of the old versions—the Italic, Vulgate, Coptic, Armenian, Gothic, Æthiopic. It is approved of by Mill, Bengel, Griesbach, Scholz, and adopted into the text by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford. *Bethsaidan* or *Bethsaida=Fish-town*. See Matt. xi, 21. Expositors are divided in opinion in reference to the particular *Bethsaida* referred to,—some, such as Petter, supposing it to be the Galilean *Bethsaida* that was *near Capernaum* on the western side of the lake; others supposing that it was the Gaulonitish Bethsaida on the eastern side of the Jordan, a little to the north of the lake. This eastern Bethsaida was in the tetrarchy of Philip. He took a fancy to the place; and, with the architectural genius that was inherent in the Herod-family, greatly improved it, and called it *Julias*, in honour of the emperor's daughter. (See on chap. vi, 32.) Köstlin supposes that it must be the Galilean Bethsaida that is meant, (*Ursprung*, p. 348). Griesbach, on the other hand, and Fritzsche and Meyer, justly contend that the reference is to the Bethsaida that lay in the natural route to the district of Cæsarea Philippi. (See verse 27.) Jesus was finding it needful to shun publicity, and keep at a distance from Galilee. Both for his own sake, and for the spiritual and educational benefit of his disciples, he sought seclusion.———*And they bring to him a blind man*:—His blindness had been superinduced as a disease. He had not been born blind. (See verse 24.) Note the present tense, *they bring*, lying in continuity with the preceding expression, *they come*. We are taken back by the narrator to the time when the events occurred, and see them *eventuating*.———*And besought him*:—It is still the present tense in the evangelist's phraseology,—*and beseech him*.———*To touch him*:—Literally, *in order that he might touch him*. They specify *touching*, under the impression, most probably, that contact was indispensable for the transition of the healing "virtue."

Ver. 23. *And he took the blind man by the hand*:—Literally, *and he took hold of the hand of the blind man*.———*And led him outside the town*:—Or *village* rather. The word (κώμη) is generally, in the New Testament, though not always, translated *village*. It naturally means *village*, but it is applied by John to Bethlehem (vii, 42). Josephus mentions that the tetrarch Philip raised Bethsaida from the condition of a *village* (κώμη) to the status and dignity of a *city* or *town* (πόλεως παρασχὼν ἀξίωμα—*Ant.* xviii, 2, 1). Mark, however, would make no pretension to nice distinctions in the matter of municipal prerogatives, and would probably use, uncritically, the old appropriate term because of the relative smallness of the place.—Jesus, still shunning publicity, *led the blind man outside the village*. Instead of *led* (ἐξήγαγεν), Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Alford insert in their texts, on some very high manuscriptural authority, a verb that suggests *bearing* or *conveying* (ἐξήνεγκεν), rather than *leading*. It is the reading of ℵBCL, 33. It is just another way of expressing the idea that is embodied in the Received Text,—only it throws into shade, comparatively, the agency of the blind man himself, and thus gives greater prominence to the agency of our Lord. The man, it would appear, did not belong to Bethsaida, (see verse 26). He

town. And when he had *spit on his eyes, and put his hands upon him, he asked him if he saw ought. 24 And

*Chap. 7. 33.

had probably been brought from one of the adjoining hamlets. And hence our Lord took the precautionary plan of conveying him to some distance from the town before he operated on him. Had he cured him in the town, the man would have become a public Spectacle, and the rush and crush of the excited multitude would still more have interfered with the spiritual and physical requirements of the disciples, and with the limitations of our Lord's own humanity. (See chap. ii, 2; iii, 7—10, 20; iv, 1; v, 24; vi, 31—33, 56.)———*And when he had spit on his eyes*: Literally, *into his eyes*. Petter, Heumann, and Dr. Samuel Clarke, interlace this expression with the clause immediately following, so as to bring out the idea that our Lord touched the man's eyes *with saliva on his finger*. It is enough, however, that we do not import into the statement our own British manners, customs, prejudices, and feelings. Deficiency in dignity on the one hand, and contempt on the other, have been often manifested by certain modes and circumstances of making use of what Tacitus calls "the excrement of the mouth" (*oris excrementum.—Hist.* iv, 81). But saliva, when natural, is not excrementitious; and a certain simple, semi-medicinal, use of it, in certain exceptional conditions, is in no respect unnatural or unbecoming. It is beneficial. And yet as it is only, to a very limited degree, and in the case of exceedingly slight disorders, that its beneficial influence is appreciable, its employment in the instance before us would all the more strikingly serve as a foil to display the presence and operation of a higher power. Its application indicated the *source* of the curative virtue, at the very time that it suggested the utter inadequacy of all ordinary remedial measures.———*He put his hands upon him*:—The *and* which introduces this clause in our Authorized Version is an import into the evangelist's text. It is not in *any* of the first-class manuscripts. The only uncial, in which it is found, is G. It is not in any of the critical editions, older or more recent. It is not even in the *Textus Receptus*. It is introduced, however, interpretatively, into the Syriac Version, and the versions of Erasmus, Luther, Beza. In these versions the construction of the passage is assumed to be as follows,—*and he spit into his eyes, put his hands on him, and then asked him if he saw ought*. But it would be more precisely represented thus, *and when he had spit into his eyes, he laid his hands on him and asked him if he saw ought*. (See Fritzsche.) The application of the saliva is represented as precursive in relation to the conjoint acts that followed consecutively,—the acts of manual imposition and oral interrogation. The way in which our Lord imposed his hands, or the local direction which he gave to the act of manual imposition, is ascertained from the 25th verse. He laid his hands over the eyes of the patient.———*And asked him if he saw ought*: He desired to draw, and draw out, the attention of the man to the process of restoration. The phrase in the original finely "*presentiates*" the scene,—*he questioned him if he 'sees' ought.—Ought*:—Or better still—*aught*, that is, *anything*, literally *a whit*. See chap. vii, 12.

VER. 24. *And he looked up*: Namely, toward the source of light, as was natural. That was the first visual movement which the man made. But he

he looked up, and said, I see men as trees, walking. 25 After that he put *his* hands again upon his eyes, and made him look up: and he was restored, and saw every man clearly.

---

speedily looked *round* as well as *up*. See next clause. Erasmus took a wrong notion of the import of the verb. He translates it, *having received sight (recepto visu).*———*And said, I see men as trees walking*: The participle *walking* agrees, in virtue of its gender, not with the *trees*, but with the *men*. *I see men walking as if they were trees.* The correct reading of the text, however, brings out more interestingly, though abruptly and ruggedly, the broken utterances of the man,—*I behold the men, for I see them walking about like trees.* Note the *for*. Probably after he had looked up and looked round, he would be asked whether he saw the men who were before him. They moved about that he might the more readily notice and distinguish them. He saw them!—but dimly, and indistinctly, and as persons magnified in a mist. *I behold them!* he exclaims. And, he was sure that they were men; *'for' though they seemed rather like trees than men, yet they were walking about!* This,—no doubt the true reading of the text,—is found in the Sinaitic (ℵ), Alexandrine (A), and Vatican (B) manuscripts, as well as in almost all the rest of the uncials. It was not approved of by Griesbach; but it is received into the text by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford. It is, moreover, the reading in all Stephens's editions and Erasmus's, and in the Elzevir of 1624 too. But it was changed by the Elzevirs in their edition of 1633 into the more easy-going reading from which our Authorized Translation was made. They had been swayed, apparently, by the judgement of Beza, who in all his editions, after that of 1565, inserted and defended the easy-going reading. This easy-going reading was found in his ancient manuscript (D), and in the Complutensian edition. It is supported, apparently, by the Old Latin version, and the Vulgate, Coptic, Peshito-Syriac, Philoxenian-Syriac, Armenian, and Æthiopic versions. The Gothic, however, corresponds with the reading of the great body of the uncial manuscripts; and some of the other versions may be accounted for on the principle of a free translation.

Ver. 25. *Then he put his hands again upon his eyes, and made him look up*:—Instead of this last clause, which seems to have been originally a marginal annotation, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Alford read *and he* (viz., *the man*) *looked through* (διέβλεψεν), that is, *looked so as to discriminate between objects.* This is the reading of the manuscripts ℵBCLΔ, 1, and of the Coptic and Æthiopic versions. The phrase seems to have been annotated at an early period, and hence the reading of the Received Text, and some other rival readings. Griesbach felt so perplexed by their variety that he came to the conclusion that *all of them* were marginal, so that nothing should intervene between the clause *he put his hands again upon his eyes*, and the resultant clause *and he was restored*. (See his *Com. Crit.* in loc.) It is likely, however, that the reading of ℵB is genuine. The same verb occurs in Matt. vii, 5, and Luke vi, 42, and is translated *see clearly*. When it is used *absolutely*, as in the case before us, it denotes *discriminative looking*, and thus brings into view the *energy of volition* in distinct seeing.———*And he was restored, and saw every man clearly*:—Or, more literally, *and beheld all men clearly*. But instead of *all men*

26 And he sent him away to his house, saying, Neither go into the town, nor tell *it* to any in the town.

---

a preponderance of the highest authorities reads *all things*. In the original there is only the difference of a single letter between the two readings (ἅπαντα for ἅπαντας.) *All things* is the reading of ℵBCDLΔ, 1, 69, and is supported by the great majority of the Old Latin Codices, as also by the Vulgate Version, the Syriac Versions, and the Coptic, Armenian, and Æthiopic. The word rendered *clearly* (τηλαυγῶς or ὀηλαυγῶς) is properly objective in its import, *conspicuously*. But here it is used subjectively, *distinctly*.— —It is somewhat remarkable that it is recorded by both Tacitus (*Hist.* iv, 81) and Suetonius (*Vesp.* c. 7.) that when Vespasian was in Alexandria he was besought both by a blind man, and by a lame man, to cure them of their respective ailments. They had been directed, they alleged, by the god Serapis to apply to him. The blind man besought him *to spit into his eyes*. The lame man besought him to touch with his foot the disabled member. He treated the applications at first with disdain, says Tacitus, as something ridiculous. But as the poor men persisted in their suits, acting toward him as if he were a god, he ordered his physicians to examine the cases, and report to him whether or not they were curable. *The physicians alleged that they were not incurable.* And, at length, therefore, yielding, or affecting to yield, to the entreaties of the poor men, and the urgency of his flatterers, he did as he was desired. He dispensed his royal "virtue," as if he were divine; and immediately, it is alleged, *the blind man saw*, and *the lame man's lameness disappeared*. We need not say, perhaps, with Casaubon, that "the devil" was seeking to throw discredit on the miracles of our Lord by a piece of pantomimic "buffoonery." But we are justified in feeling suspicious in reference to the trustworthiness of the narrations. There are, indeed, cases in which the royal touch of right royal natures has been efficacious in rectifying certain nervous disorders. The imagination is potent in its influence. So is hope. So is faith. And *there are* subtle physical magnetisms too. But it is likely that there was *claptrap* in the cases that are signalized by Tacitus and Suetonius. The physicians saw through the real state of the case, and helped to work the wires behind the curtains. The whole affair seems to have been got up for the occasion,—to yield Vespasian the incense of adulation on the one hand, and to sway the minds of the superstitious Egyptian multitude on the other into the full conviction of his divine right to the purple. (See Heumann's *Dissertation on the Miracles of Vespasian*, 1707.) The circumstances of "the humble Nazarene" were altogether different.

VER. 26. *And he sent him away to his home, saying, Neither go into the town*:—Or, *But do not enter into the village*. In telling him to go home, our Saviour insisted on him going directly. Hence the injunction, *But do not enter into the village*, (μηδέ,—neither μήτε, nor μή as in Tischendorf). Our Lord did not wish to make a Spectacle of the man, and stir up the superficial curiosity and enthusiasm of the population in reference to himself as a Thaumaturge or Wonder-worker.———*Nor tell (it) to any one in the village*:—A clause that has occasioned a great deal of perplexity from the remotest times. How was it possible, it was and is asked, for the man to tell the fact and mode of his

27 [y] And Jesus went out, and his disciples, into the towns of Cæsarea Philippi: and by the way [y] Mat. 16. 13. Luke 9. 18.

---

cure *to any one in the village,* if *he did not enter the village?* How, then, could the Saviour give such a superfluous injunction? Was it not enough to have given either one or other of the two commands. In the Sinaitic and Vatican Manuscripts, as well as in L and I, the second clause is actually omitted; and Tischendorf, in his 8th edition of the text, follows in their wake, and suppresses the last clause. Wrongly however. For we may rest assured that no transcriber would ever have dreamed of adding such a clause, as a mere invention or improvement of his own. The Vulgate Version of the verse runs thus, *And he sent him to his home, saying, Go to thy home, and if thou shouldest enter into the village tell (it) to no one.* A similar reading is found in manuscript 69, and in the margin of the Philoxenian-Syriac Version. But it is an obvious tinkering to smoothe away the apparent incongruity of the two injunctions. The incongruity is only apparent. The two injunctions might after all be only parts of what our Lord found it needful to say in the circumstances. Most likely the man would be in ecstacies, and anxious to rush, right off, into the village that he might herald the wonderful deliverer, by proclaiming his own wonderful deliverance. Our Lord might need to add "precept to precept," and to emphasise and vary his expressions, in order to succeed in impressing the excited man with his real desire. *You must leave me indeed; "but do not enter into the village." Go home directly. Tell all that has happened, if you choose, to your own friends at your own home; "but do not tell it to any one in the village." If you have acquaintances in the village who will be hovering about in the outskirts, on the outlook for you, and with whom therefore you would meet were you to go close by the quarter where they are,—keep out of their way. Go in another direction. I wish at present to have seclusion with my disciples.* Grotius hit, *substantially,* on the right idea. The phrase is elliptical, he said, and means, *nor tell it even to any one (of those who are) in the village,* that is, *to any one of the inhabitants of the village.* Dr. Samuel Clarke, Rosenmüller, Bland, adopt his explication. Lange contends for it. It is too stiff and artificial as a precise interpretation: but it is in substance correct.

Verses 27—30 form a condensed paragraph corresponding to the more detailed narrative in Matt. xvi, 13—20. See also Luke ix, 18—21.

Ver. 27. *And Jesus went out, and his disciples*:—They *went out,* or *went forth,* as the verb is sometimes translated (Matt. xiii, 3; xiv, 14, &c.); or, *departed,* as it is elsewhere rendered (Matt. xxviii, 8; Mark vii, 31, &c.). They departed *from Bethsaida.* (See verse 22.)———They went northward *into the towns of Cæsarea Philippi*:—That is, *into the hamlets,* or *villages* (see ver. 23), *that dotted the district of country, of which Cæsarea Philippi was the centre.* This *Cæsarea Philippi* or *Philip's Cæsarea,* belonged to Philip "the tetrarch of Gaulonitis, Trachonitis, and Paneas," (*Josephus Ant.* xvii, 8. 1). It not only belonged to him, it had in a great measure been built by him. (See *Josephus Ant.* xviii, 2. 1; *War,* ii, 9. 1.) It stood on the site of an old heathen city called *Paneas* (see *Josephus, ut supra);* and, strange to say, this, its ancient name, has survived its fashionable Cæsarean designation. The place is called *Banias* at the present

he asked his disciples, saying unto them, Whom do men say that I am? 28 And they answered, [z]John the [z] Mat. 14. 2.

day. It was in honour of the Roman Cæsar,—the emperor Tiberias,—that Philip called it *Cæsarea*. And it was necessary to call it *Philip's Cæsarea*, or *Cæsarea Philippi*, to distinguish it from the still more important *Cæsarea*, in which the Roman procurator generally resided, and which was situated southward on the shore of the Mediterranean. (See Acts viii, 40; ix, 30, &c.) The northern Cæsarea, to which Jesus and his disciples now betook themselves, lay in the centre of some of the grandest scenery in Syria. "The situation," says Dr. Tristram, "is indeed magnificent." He adds,—"With tall limestone cliffs "to the north and east, a rugged torrent of basalt to the south, and a gentle "wooded slope for its western front, Banias is almost hidden till the traveller "is among the ruins. These are not remarkable, the best preserved being the "old Roman bridge over the impetuous stream which has hewn out its channel "in the black basalt to the south. Everywhere there is a wild medley of "cascades, mulberry-trees, fig-trees, dashing torrents, festoons of vines, bubbling fountains, reeds, and ruins, and the mingled music of birds and waters." (*The Land of Israel*, p. 586.) Such is Banias, or Cæsarea Philippi, as it now appears. The royal residence of Philip, when visiting in the district, would be the adjoining castle of Subeibeh,—one of the marvels of the East. It "stands "proudly," says Mr. Macgregor, "on a height guarded by sheer cliff all round, "except at the entrance gate."—"Heidelberg is not so large; nor has it any"thing like the view we have before us here. Towers and bastions are round "about; and huge walls and court-yards fill the ample space within. A thou"sand men here, more or less, would not crowd the visitors' rooms, or weigh "upon the grand old masonry. Built by the Herods first perhaps, or by "Phœnician masons, it was an outwork, afterwards, of the Holy War, when "nations were fired with phrenzy for the Land of the Cross." (*Rob Roy on the Jordan*, p. 233.) The other object of transcendent interest at Cæsarea Philippi is the fountain, *that forms one of the sources of the Jordan*. It is, says Dr. Tristram, "a wonderful fountain, like a large bubbling basin, the largest spring in Syria, "and said to be the largest single fountain in the world, where the drainage of "the southern side of Hermon, pent up between a soft and a hard stratum, seems "to have found a collective exit. Full grown at birth, at once larger than "the Hasbany which it joins, the river dashes through an oleander thicket." (*The Land of Israel*, p. 585.) Such was the central scene of the picturesque region, in which our Lord sought and found seclusion with his disciples.——*And by the way*:—Or, *in the way*, that is, while journeying northward on the eastern side of the Jordan in the direction of Cæsarea Philippi.——*He questioned his disciples, saying to them, whom do men say that I am?* Very literally, *the men*. The meaning is, *whom do 'the people' say that I am?* The question would be asked, we may presume, not so much for the Saviour's personal information (John ii, 25), as to be a leader into the personal opinions or convictions of his disciples. See verse 29.

VER. 28. *And they answered him, saying*, (εἶπαν αὐτῷ λέγοντες), *John the Baptist*:—That was one popular notion regarding him, circulating no doubt chiefly among those who had never seen him. Herod Antipas entertained it.

Baptist: but some *say*, Elias; and others, One of the prophets.
29 And he saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am?

(chap. vi, 16). His imprimatur would give it currency in certain circles; and the Saviour's conspicuous purity and incorruptibility would lend it support. His miracles would be accounted for on the principle that he had brought back with him, as was to be expected, from the world of spirits, some distinctive additions to the powers which he had formerly possessed. (Matt. xiv, 2.)———*And* (καὶ) *others* (*say*) *Elias* :–Or, Hebraistically, *Eliyah*,—the Great Ideal of a prophet and spiritual reformer. It was very generally expected that he was to return to the earth in connection with the Messiah's advent. (Mal. iv, 5.) And some, who could not entertain the idea that the humble Nazarene was the Messiah himself, conjectured that he was nevertheless the veritable Old Testament Elias, the great Precursor of the Messiah.———*But others, One of the Prophets* :–They could not go so far as to identify him with Elias. Neither could they be positive that he had any very special relation to the long-expected Messiah. His rank was perhaps too humble for that. But they were quite sure that he was altogether different from all the modern men whom they had seen, or of whom they had heard. And hence they concluded that he must belong to a bygone heroic age. *Must he not be*, they would reason, *a re-incarnation of one or other of the old prophets?* A wild conjecture; but easy perhaps to the untutored imaginations of many Galileans in the days of our Lord.

VER. 29. *And he saith unto them* :–Or, according to the reading of Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, *and he questioned them* (ἐπηρώτα).———*But whom say ye that I am?*–Instead of *whom* read *who*. (See Bishop Lowth's *English Grammar*, p. 133.) Or, according to the emphasis of the original, *But ye, who do ye say that I am?* The time was come when it was of the greatest moment that they should have a settled conception of his real character and mission. No doubt the true light on the subject had often gleamed through the darkness of their minds. (See John i, 29, 33, 34, 41, 45, 49, &c.) But, though gleam succeeded gleam, in flashes that revealed the Illimitable, the darkness would ever, more or less, close in again. They could not altogether help it. They were witnesses of a "humiliation" of state, which they could not reconcile with the notions they had inherited in reference to the power and pomp of the Messiah. And yet it was evident that he was entirely unlike all other Rabbis. He was the Master of Masters, and a Mystery over and above. An inner lustre was continually breaking through. It was glorious. It was unique. His character was transcendently noble and pure. He had not, moreover, obtruded self-assertions on them. He had left them, in a great measure, to observe for themselves; and they *had been* observing. But they needed time to steep their minds in what they observed. They needed time to combine and compare their observations, one with another, and then to work out the inferences that were involved. But now they had got sufficient time, and the end of the Master's terrestrial career was looming, big with both human and divine interests, into view. He saw that it would be of the utmost moment that the faith of his nearest adherents should, from henceforth, faithfully and fixedly reflect the actual realities of his high condition and commission. Hence the

And Peter answereth and saith unto him, [a]Thou art the Christ. 30 And he [b]charged them that they should tell no man of him.

[a] John 1. 41. John 6. 69. John 11. 27.
[b] Mat. 16. 20.

decisive question here recorded.——*And Peter answered*:—With that honest readiness and impulsiveness which were so characteristic of his nature, and which fitted him for being a leader of the little circle.——*And says to him*:—Note the conjunction of tenses. He *answered* and *says*. We are led, firstly, to look back, and notice the historical fact that Peter *answered*. Then, secondly, we are led back into the heart of the scene and hear him speaking: he *says* ——*Thou art the Christ*: A great improvement on Wycliffe's Version, *Thou or Crist*. And yet Luther's Version is the same as Wycliffe's; and Piscator's the same as Luther's. Inexcusably so, on the part of both. It is as if they had allowed the Latin Vulgate to press in, dominatingly, on their memory, (*Tu es Christus*). Tyndale's Version was a great advance, *Thou arte very Christe*. It was adopted by Coverdale, and in the first edition of the Geneva. In the corrected Geneva, however, the right translation was at length introduced, *Thou art the Christ*. Bengel has, correspondingly, *Thou art the Anointed* (*du: Gesalbte*). Count Zinzendorf, Mace, and Principal Campbell have, Hebraisingly, *Thou art the Messiah*. Erasmus and Beza, in their Latin versions, have *Thou art that Christ* (*Tu es ille Christus*, and Erasmus Schmid improves on the expression, *Tu es Christus ille*). It was a decisive answer, and given, as even Schenkel admits, "as out of a higher inspiration." (*Charakterbild*, xii. 4.) The Lord himself, as we learn from Matthew xvi, 17, traced the thought to its true divine source. And yet it was no doubt founded on evidence which the disciple had diligently studied, and logically construed to his own inner satisfaction. It was evidence which, when impartially weighed in the balance of judicial reason, warranted the conclusion. That conclusion, therefore, would, we may be sure, be everything the reverse of a mere semi-mechanical reverberation of any mere assertion that had been mechanically heard from the lips of "the Christ" himself. *It was not 'the Christ's' manner to bear much testimony to himself by his lips* (John v, 31). He left his life and his labours to speak for him. (John v, 36). Peter listened to *their* voice and was convinced. Petter explains Peter's confession thus,—"Thou art "that special and singular Person ordained of God to be the Mediator "between God and us, and to be the Redeemer and Saviour of all mankind;"—an admirable explanation, though its sharply-cut shaping is somewhat indebted to the century, and the eminently theological ecclesiastical community, in which the commentator lived.

VER. 30. Mark omits entirely the Saviour's encomium on Peter,—an encomium that budded out into specific prediction and promise of high spiritual prerogatives. If Peter himself be regarded as the chief Well-spring of Mark's information, the omission is easily accounted for, as Eusebius remarks (*Demonstrat. Evang.* lib. iii, 121, 122), on a principle honourable to the modesty of the apostle. But it would be altogether unaccountable, if it were in that encomium alone, that the true basis is found for the true constitution of the Christian church. Yet it *is* in that encomium alone, that Roman Catholic theologians find, or found, the doctrine of the primacy of the Roman

31 [c]And he began to teach them, that the Son [c] Mat. 16. 21. Luke 9. 22.

---

Popes. It is, they maintain, in virtue of these Roman Popes being Peter's legitimate successors, that they are entitled to primacy; and that primacy is essential, in their estimation, to the visible hierarchy and normal existence of the church.—Köstlin, from his peculiar standpoint, would say that the *Petrinism* of Mark is not so exclusive, or so strongly pronounced, as the Petrinism of Matthew. (*Ursprung*, p. 366.)———*And he charged them*:–Peremptorily. See, on the word, chapter iii, 12.———*That they should tell no man of him*:–Or, *in order that they should say to no one concerning him* (viz. *what they had said to himself*.) The reason is not,—as Cartwright, under the pressure of a singular theological strain, suggests (*Harmonia*, p. 569),—that men would have been deterred from putting him to death, so that the atonement would not have been completed. Cardinal Cajetan comes nearer the reality. Men, he says, would have suspected that he was affecting the Jewish throne, and cherishing designs at variance with the rule of the Herods and the supremacy of the Cæsars. There is, it must be remembered, "a time to keep silence," as well as "a time to speak" (Eccles. iii, 7). And the state of society at once in the tetrarchy of Philip, and the tetrarchy of Antipas, and throughout the rest of Palestine, was such, that direct public, or even private, promulgation, on the part of the disciples, of our Lord's Messiah-hood would, at that particular time, have done much injury and little or no good. A favourable party, –comprehending a considerable multitude of ultroneous but unindoctrinated adherents, –would have sought to take him by force and get him crowned. (John vi, 15.) Another party,—who were as yet, only considering his true character, but disposed to look upon him as exceptionally noble and mysteriously superior to all ordinary men,—would have been prematurely stumbled. A third, and large, and politically influential, and adverse, party were eagerly waiting to get hold of an excuse to put an instant arrest upon his proceedings. Indoctrination was needed throughout all the reaches of Jewish society,—indoctrination in the grand fundamental principles of true religion. The indoctrination of the very elite of the disciples themselves was much required. (See verse 32.) They were seeing only patches of the divine reality; and some of these patches they were seeing only very intermittingly. The teaching of events was needed by them; more especially the teaching of the dark events, which were already casting their long shadows before, and which, as they advanced, seemed to be the very "blackness of darkness," –although to penetrative eyes, the cloud was radiant on the other side, and pointing, like a pillar of fire, in the direction of the Land of liberty and the Kingdom of heaven.

Verses 31—33 form a little appended paragraph, closely connected with the paragraph that immediately precedes. It corresponds to Matthew xvi, 21—23. See also Luke ix, 22.

Ver. 31. *And he began to teach them*:–To *instruct* the disciples,—for their minds, like the minds of most of their compeers in the nation, were full of fancies in reference to the Messiah.———*That the Son of man must suffer many things*:–Or, more literally still, *that it is necessary that the Son of man*

of man must suffer many things, and be rejected of the elders, and *of* the chief priests, and scribes, and be killed, and

---

*suffer many things.* Note the present tense, *it 'is' necessary.* The substance of the Saviour's teaching is thus presented in the *direct* form of report. Hence the preliminary "*that*," though in accordance with the Greek idiom, would almost need to be merged out of sight in our English idiom. It is, so far as the eye is concerned, somewhat equivalent *to the inverted commas* of quotation.—*It is necessary* :–That is, *It is, in the circumstances, inevitable.* The Saviour, indeed, could, in a moment, have lifted himself up into a sphere in which he would have been for ever far above the possibility of human assault and personal suffering. But if he deemed it desirable to carry on the work of popular indoctrination, it was inevitable that he should meet with opposition on the part of those whose errors he exposed, and whose selfishness, and selfish influence in society, he resisted. And if too he had it in view, over and above, to meet one of the greatest difficulties in Political Economy, human or divine, *the difficulty of granting pardon to criminals*, then there might be, and no doubt there was, a *relative necessity* of submitting, in a public and conspicuous manner, to sufferings that might have an atoning value, in the Divine Moral Government. Both the precept and the penalty of the Law,—and the penalty, like all else that is right, is, as well as the precept, unspeakably important and good,—would thus be honoured. (See Heb. ii, 10; viii, 3; ix, 12, 22, 23.)—*The Son of man* :–The Saviour, while admitting the name "*the Christ*," and rejoicing in spirit over Peter's employment of the designation, yet adheres, in his own personal phraseology, to his favourite appellation of himself. He had voluntarily descended into the plane of humanity, and it was his delight to realise his oneness with the race.—*Suffer 'many things'* :–It is an admirably literal translation. But if the peculiarity of idioms be taken into account, the phrase very closely corresponds to our English expression *suffer 'much.'* (See chap. ix, 26, and Rom. xvi, 6, 12.) ———*And be rejected* :–Or *disallowed*, as the word is rendered in 1 Pet. ii, 4, 7. The preceding English translation—that of the Geneva and Tyndale—was *reproved*, that is, *reprobated.*———*By the elders, and the high-priests, and the scribes* :–The three constituents of the Sanhedrim. The *elders* would be chosen because of their material and political influence: the *high-priests* because of their elevated ecclesiastical position: the *scribes* because of their literary and rabbinical qualifications. The word *elders* had become a term of office,—its reference to age being merged. The word *high-priests* would include *the High-priest* proper, and *the high-priests emeriti* if such there were, and the chiefs of the four-and-twenty courses. The *scribes* of the Sanhedrim would be the most eminent of those who knew *letters*, and who would consequently be learned in the Law and the Traditions.———*And be killed* :–Or put *to a violent death.* He foresaw it all! And yet went steadily onward to the consummation of his mediatorial career! In the midst of his vivid anticipation of the effects of human ignorance, recklessness, rage, and rabid bloodthirstiness, he discerned an undercurrent of grand divine ends, that rolled steadily onward, like wave on wave, in the direction of the weal of the universe. Hence the next clause.———*And after three days rise again* :–

after three days rise again. 32 And he spake that saying openly. And Peter took him, and began to rebuke him. 33 But when he had turned about and looked on his dis-

---

Some grand mediatorial purpose was to be subserved by the death; but the state of death was to be only temporary, and for an exceedingly brief period. The Saviour of men must be *alive for evermore.* There were indeed grand purposes which could not be realized, unless he lived.—*After three days*:—It was customary among the Jews, as among many other peoples, to be somewhat indeterminate in the designation of certain periods of time. Thus the phrase *after three days* might either mean, *after the period that is covered by three complete days,* or *after the period that is covered by one complete day, flanked on either side by two incomplete days.* The day at the commencement, and the day at the conclusion of the whole period, might, according to circumstances, be either complete or incomplete. In the one case the time referred to would be *after every day had been completed.* In the other it would be *after the three days respectively had been more or less touched.* This is the meaning of the phrase here, so that the expression, notwithstanding Fritzsche's protest, is equivalent to *on the third day.* Compare 2 Chron. x, 5, 12. Compare also the two synonymous expressions in English, *this day eight days* and *this day sennight* or *seven nights.* Krebs gives a large induction of particular cases, more especially from the writings of Josephus, in which the same latitude in the counting of time occurs. (*Observat.* in loc.)

VER. 32. *And he spake that saying openly*:—There is no need for the strong demonstrative *that.* It is simply *the saying* in the original,—*the saying,* namely, to which he had just given expression. He uttered it *openly*; or *plainly,* as Wycliffe and the Geneva have it. The contrast is not to the idea of *secrecy,* but to the idea of *mystery.* Our Saviour made the statement *explicitly* and *unambiguously,* without any involution of parable, metaphor, or enigma, (ἀπαρακαλύπτως as Euthymius Zigabenus has it). He did not, as he had done before, speak of *being lifted up,* of *building the temple in three days,* or of *being, Jonah-like, three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.* (John iii, 14; ii, 19; Matt. xii, 40.)———*And Peter took him and began to rebuke him*:—*To reprimand him; to chyde him,* as Tyndale has it; very literally, *to rate him.* So very partial, on the one hand, were Peter's notions of the Lord's Messiahship. And so very partial, on the other, was the normal development of his feelings in relation to his Lord. The idea of the violent death of him who was "the Christ,"—a violent death too at the hands of the chieftains of the people,—ran so thoroughly counter to all the fond conceptions he had been cherishing in reference to the success of his Master's enterprise, that for the moment his feelings of reverence were overridden. *Do not say such things! You speak of impossibilities! You are surely giving way to despondency! You will dishearten us all! Such things must not be!* "No "wonder," says Richard Baxter, "if novices now think themselves wiser "than their wisest Teachers." "This world," says Hofmeister, "has many "Peters, who wish to be wiser than Christ, and to prescribe to him what it "is needful to do."

VER. 33. *But he, when he had turned about*:—Not *to Peter,* as Meyer and

ciples, he [d]rebuked Peter, saying, [c]Get thee behind me. Satan: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but the things that be of men.

[d] Rev. 3. 19.
[c] Mat. 4. 10. Luke 4. 8.

---

Alexander strangely suppose, but *from* him, under a feeling of disapprobation. ———*And looked on his disciples*:–Or rather, *and saw his disciples*,—the group of the eleven, from whom Peter had taken him aside. Our Lord turned *toward them*, and, *when he saw them*, he spake to Peter. *He turned purposely, wishing to see them, and to make his statement to Peter in their hearing.* Wakefield freely, but admirably, renders the expression thus,—*but he turned about, and, 'in the presence of his disciples,' rebuked Peter.* The verb, rendered, in our Authorized Version, *looked on*, simply means *saw*. It is translated *looked* or *looked on* in only other seven passages of the New Testament, (Luke x, 32; John vii, 52; Rev. iv, 1; vi, 8; xiv, 1, 14; xv, 5), and, as regards all of these, it would have been better had it received its customary translation.——— *Rebuked Peter, saying, get behind me, Satan*:–Though it was Peter who had spoken, the Saviour recognized the presence of a Subtler Intellect. He recognized his old "Adversary" who had assaulted him in the wilderness with the idea of worldly greatness and success (Matt. iii, 8—10). Hence his language. Peter indeed was to be blamed, and *was* blamed. But the address went intentionally farther—deeper. The word *Satan* means *adversary*, but was conventionally applied among the Jews to the Great Adversary.—*Get behind me!*–An expression of strong disapprobation and dislike, *Get out of my sight!* It throws light upon the *turning* of our Saviour. *In turning from Peter*, our Lord was really putting "behind" him the Evil Being, who was tempting him through Peter.———*For thou savourest not the things of God, but the things of men*:–The Saviour, in these words, speaks home to the personality of Peter. He pays no farther heed, as it were, to the Darker Presence behind. Peter, under the influence of that Presence, was suffering the eye of his intelligence to be eclipsed, and hence he was allowing his interests to gather clusteringly around what would be immediately agreeable to merely human feelings, instead of what would be agreeable to the mind and heart of God.—*Savourest*: A word that is now, in general, used objectively. But our translators,—following in the wake of Wycliffe, Tyndale, and Coverdale—used it subjectively, as equivalent to *relishest*,—Petter's word, and Principal Campbell's. It is, however, even in its archaic usage, too one-sided to do justice to the original term, (*φρονεῖς*). The idea is, *thou art 'minding.'* (Compare Rom. viii, 5; Phil. ii, 5; iii, 16, 19, &c.) There is reference to the *thinking* element of the *mind*, as well as to its *feeling* element; and indeed, to the *thinking* element prominently. But the Geneva Version goes too far in that direction,—*thou understandest*. Bengel's Version is better, *thou considerest* (du bedenkest). Count Zinzendorf's is also good, *thou art concerning thyself* (es ist dir um zu thun). Newcome has, *thou regardest*. Peter was *allowing his 'mind'* to be occupied with things human as distinguished from things divine. *The things of God*:–The reference is to the divine idea, and the coincident divine pleasure, in relation to the real and permanent weal of men as moral, immortal, and yet sinful beings. *An atonement was an essential element in that Idea and Pleasure.* And, as to the atonement again,

34 [f] And when he had called the people *unto him* with his disciples also, he said unto them, [g] Whosoever will come after me, let him deny himself, and

[f] Mat. 16. 24. Luke 9. 23.
[g] Mat. 10. 38. Luke 14. 27. 2 Tim. 3. 12.

---

*suffering and death were essential to its completion.* Peter was allowing his mind to get away from the impress of such thoughts, or of what, if logically pursued, would have led to them; and he was occupied with *the things of men*, or as Luther has it, *with what is human.* Man is too apt to occupy himself with what is immediately agreeable. Peter would have liked the power, pomp, wealth, and splendour of the Messiah's kingdom, in a few weeks or months.

Verses 34—38, along with verse 1 of chapter ix, constitute a paragraph, consecutive in relation to the preceding one, and corresponding to Matt. xvi, 24—28, and Luke ix, 23—27.

Ver. 34. *And when he had called to him the crowd along with his disciples*: For even in that out-of-the-way locality, he was identified, and followed by groups of expectant hangers-on, who were eager to see and hear. At the present day, nothing is easier in Syria than to gather a crowd. Almost every stranger at once attracts a following. What must it have been when it was reported, in the hamlets surrounding Cæsarea Philippi, that the Great Prophet of Nazareth was in the vicinity! De Wette, however, can only see in the word *crowd* a wilful expansion, and therefore a real misinterpretation, on the part of Mark, of the word *all* employed by Luke, in his less determinate narrative of the occurrence (ix, 23). This *all*, says de Wette, Luke intended to be applied to *the disciples only*, inasmuch as it is said in the 18th verse that our Lord had been "alone praying." (*Handbuch*, in loc.) Baur accepts de Wette's idea, and thence builds an argument in relation to the interdependencies of the Gospels. *Mark*, says he, *must have had Luke's Gospel lying before him.* (*Marcusevang.* pp. 65—67.) But it is utterly gratuitous to assume, that because our Lord was "alone praying," he continued "alone" long after his prayers were concluded. It is not only gratuitous,—it is also a most improbable supposition. If our Lord was known to be engaged in prayer,—the groups of followers would, in accordance with Oriental reverence, respect his seclusion, and keep at a distance. But when they noticed that his prayers were concluded, and that he was engaged in earnest conversation with his disciples, they would naturally begin to draw nearer, although modestly refraining from pressing exceedingly near. Between Luke's *all* (not *them all*) and Mark's *crowd along with his disciples*, there is, to our view, a beautiful coincidence that bespeaks a common source of accurate information.——*He said to them, whosoever will come after me*:—There was an eagerness among many of the people to "come after him." The wistfulness of a considerable proportion of the northern population had been awakened. They were ruminating anxiously on Old Testament predictions, and filled with vague expectancy. They saw that the Rabbi of Nazareth was no common Rabbi. He was a wonderful Being. It is not strange therefore that they pictured out to themselves all sorts of possibilities in connection with his career. *To what was he advancing? Whither was he bound? Was he on his way, or was he not, to the throne of the Kingdom?* The Saviour by and by gives

take up his cross, and follow me. 35 For [h] whoso- [h] John 12. 25.
ever will save his life shall lose it; [i] but whosoever [i] 2 Tim. 2. 12.
shall lose his life for my sake, and the gospel's, the Rev. 2. 10.

---

sufficiently explicit indications of the ultimate whitherhood of his career (verse 38. ix, 1); but meanwhile he brings into the foreground the moral conditions of adherence to his person and his cause.———*Let him deny himself*:-The word is strong in the original (ἀπαρνησάσθω),—*let him deny himself off, let him entirely renounce himself.* Let him be prepared to say No to many of the strongest cravings of his nature, in the direction more particularly of earthly ease, comfort, dignity, and glory.———*And take up his cross*:-Note the *his*. It intimates that the world in general has got ready a cross for each of Christ's disciples. So determined is it in its opposition, and so remorseless in its hate. It has resolved that every Christian shall be crucified, in one way or another. If the body cannot be got hold of and transfixed, the heart may. Every true Christian must be willing to accept this treatment for Christ's sake. He must *take up his cross*, and walk with it, as it were, to the place of execution, ready for the last extremity. It is the dark side of the case; and the phase of representation, under which it is exhibited, was no doubt suggested to our Lord by the clear view he had of the termination of his own terrestrial career. (See verse 31.) A *Christian*, says Luther, is a *Crucian*.———*And follow me*:-The Saviour pictures to his hearers a procession. He himself takes the lead with his cross. He is the chief Crucian. All his disciples follow. Each has his own particular cross. But the direction of the procession, when one looks far enough, is toward the Kingdom of heavenly glory.

VER. 35. *For whosoever will save his life*: Or, more literally, *For whosoever may will to save his life*, that is, *may wish-and-will to save his life*. Whosoever may choose to avoid crucifixion, by refusing to take up his cross and follow Christ.———*Shall lose it*: Viz. in the sphere of the future. Very literally, *he shall destroy it*. He shall lose, in the sphere of the future, the higher life, because, in the sphere of the present, he refuses to part with the lower. He shall lose everlasting ease, comfort, honour, and glory, because he refuses to part, for Christ's sake, with the ease, comfort, honour, and glory which it is in the power of the world to withhold.——*But whosoever shall lose his life*: In the sphere of the present. *Whosoever shall surrender his life to destruction.* Our authorized translation, though not a precisely literal rendering of the text that was lying before the translators, is in exactest harmony with the reading of the text that is given by the most modern editors, inclusive of Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Alford, (ὃς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσει not ἀπολέσῃ). The idea is, *whosoever shall, as a matter of fact, lose*, or *surrender to destruction, his life.* This reading is supported by the Sinaitic, Vatican, Ephraemi, and Cambridge manuscripts (ℵBCD).———*For my sake and the Gospel's*:-Two sides of that one great reality, in which the motive, which constrains to the endurance of Christian martyrdom, is found. The Gospel without Christ *would be nothing.* Christ, without the Gospel to make him known, *would be nothing* 'to us.'——— *The same shall save it*:-In the sphere of the future and the eternal. The best manuscripts and editors (inclusive of Griesbach and Scholz) omit the resumptive expression *the same*. It seems to have been imported from Luke

same shall save it. 36 For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? 37 Or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?

---

ix, 24.———The term which is translated *life* in this verse (ψυχή) is the same which is translated *soul* in the two following verses, and in many other passages. It might here too have been rendered *soul*, but not with perfect idiomatic propriety. The primary Geneva version (of 1557) gives a peculiar turn to the word, *For whosoever wyl save 'him selfe,' shal lose 'him selfe.' But whosoever shal lose 'him selfe' for my sake and the Gospel's, the same shal save 'him selfe.'* None of the English words *soul, life, self*, exactly corresponds to the Greek term. And indeed, the real comprehension of the term was left by the Greeks themselves, to a large extent, indeterminate. It originally signified *the breath.* And hence at times, it was used to denote *the concrete principle of vitality.* At other times it was used to denote, more comprehensively, *the concrete principle of self-consciousness or personality.* At other times still the two principles were identified, and at other times yet, as in the verse before us, a twofold form of vitality was regarded as attaching itself, potentially, to the concrete principle of self-consciousness and personality. *A man,—realizing his own centre of immortal self-consciousness and personality,—may, in certain critical circumstances, make choice between life terrestrial and life celestial.*

Ver. 36. *For what shall it profit a man*:—Or, according to the reading of the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts, *For what profiteth it a man.* The Saviour chooses for the present to take the standpoint of *profit*, as his standpoint of measurement and remark. He speaks, says Luther, "as an orator." Note the *For*. It carries the mind back, through the preceding verse, to the 34th, and shows why the disciples of the Saviour should not scruple to take up their crosses. The reason is partly co-ordinate with that stated in the 35th verse, but also partly modified by it and illustrative of it.———*If he should have gained*: Or, as it stands in the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts, and in Tischendorf's text, *to gain*, or *to have gained*, (κερδῆσαι).———*The whole world*:—With its fulness. What would it profit a man, were he to become the absolute proprietor of the whole of the world's soil, treasure, and population? What would this profit, if another contingency were to be concurrently realised? See next clause.———*And suffer the loss of his soul*:—The *soul* is popularly spoken of as distinct from the man who loses it,—for the reference is rather to the man's *life* than to his *being*. What would it profit a man to become the lord of the whole world, if thereby or therewith he suffer the loss of the higher life of his being, the heavenly "everlasting life"? "How poor a "price," says Richard Baxter, "is all the profit and pleasure of this life, to hire "a man by sin to lose his salvation!" "O flesh!" exclaims Luther, "how "mighty art thou, that thou canst still throw darkness over those things even "to the minds of the holy!"

Ver. 37. *Or*:—or *For*, as it is given in Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford. The Sinaitic and Vatican Manuscripts read *For*. It is *Or* in Matt. xvi, 26; and there may have been a desire, on the part of some ancient transcriber, to effect a minute identity between the two evangelists. If *For* be accepted, then what

38 [j] Whosoever therefore shall be [k] ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful

[j] Mat. 10. 33. Luke 9. 26. Luke 12. 9. [k] Rom. 1. 16. 2 Tim. 1. 8.

---

follows will be regarded as an illustration, and confirmation, of the reasoning of the preceding verse.——*What shall a man give*:-Or, according to the reading of the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts, and of Tischendorf and Tregelles, *what would a man give* (δοῖ).——*In exchange for his soul*:-What would a man not give? If he had the whole world, would he not willingly give it, provided he really knew, believed, or felt, that otherwise he would be utterly lost. King Richard, in Shakespeare, says, "My kingdom for a horse!" How many kingdoms would be surrendered—if man were not utterly infatuated—for the safety of the soul? The Saviour has gone forward in thought, and taken his standpoint in eternity. It is from that standpoint that he puts his question. It is implied that the time will come, in the experience of the persistently infatuated, when kingdom upon kingdom,—were they available,—would be an insufficient exchange for the soul. But the reference, nevertheless, is not exactly, as Petter assumes, to the "irrecoverableness" of a lost soul. It is to the incomputable value of the soul,—even in man's own judgement, when his judgement is unfettered. Strong doctrinal proclivity gave a twist to Luther's translation of the question,—*What 'can' man give wherewith to redeem his soul?* Coverdale follows Luther. Doctrinally, it is true that man "can" give nothing as a sufficient ransom. "The ransom is Jesus," as Luther remarks. But that is a direction of thought that leads away from the Saviour's present standpoint.

VER. 38. *Whosoever therefore*:-Literally, *For whosoever*. What follows is a justification, as it were, of the preceding queries. Notwithstanding the appalling nature of some of the ideas suggested by them, it was right to propose them.——*Whosoever*:-It matters not what his position or condition in this world may be.——*Shall be ashamed of me and my words*:-As many would be prone to be. The temptation to *shame* in reference to the Saviour, and the Saviour's sayings, or doctrines, continues to the present day, and is pervading society to the core, even in countries called Christian. It is one of the severest temptations, which young "converts" have to encounter. The anticipation of it is one of the mightiest motives to keep men away from conversion, and on the other side of Christian faith and fealty.——*In this adulterous and sinful generation*: A specific phase of sinfulness is put in front of the generic representation. It was outstanding and conspicuous. The men of that generation were *wantonly unfaithful to Him who was their Lord*, and who had more claims upon their faithfulness, than any husband has upon the faithfulness of his wife. God had, as it were, espoused to himself the Jewish people. (Isai. liv, 5; Jer. iii, 14.) He had conferred on them the highest possible prerogatives and honours. And yet they had proved *adulterous*, or *advouterous* as the old translations, Wycliffe's, Tyndale's, Coverdale's, the Great Bible, the first Geneva, the Rheims, give it. (Compare Jer. iii; Ezek. xvi.) Norton merges the specific peculiarity of the epithet, when he freely renders it *apostate*. The free rendering of Wakefield is, in some respects, not quite so indefinite, *ungodly*. The *name of God* was, as it were, renounced by

generation; of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels. (CHAP. IX.) 1 [l] And he said unto them, [l] Mat. 16. 28. Luke 9. 27.
Verily I say unto you, That there be some of them

---

the unfaithful people. Barnes supposed that the reference was to literal adultery. Webster-and-Wilkinson assume that such a reference is included. Unlikely. Petter is on the wrong scent, entirely, when he explains the phrase as meaning *a bastardly brood*. Dionysius à Ryckel supposes that God may be fittingly represented as having taken to himself in marriage all souls.———*Of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed*:—Not in a spirit of vindictiveness or pique, but at the bidding of a high, holy, wise, and most judicial consideration and determination. The character of him, who is ashamed of the Saviour is really shameful; and it is right that it should be treated as such by the Saviour.———*When he shall have come in the glory of his father, with the holy angels*:—To make all things right on the earth, for the ages of ages to come. He shall then judge "the quick and the dead," and render to every man according to his true character. (See Matt. xxv, 31—46; 2 Cor. v, 10; Rev. xx, 12, 13; xxii, 12.) In that coming, as distinguished from his first advent, he shall appear *in the glory of his Father*,—accompanied and encompassed with the unmistakeable insignia of the Monarch of the universe. There will then be no doubt of his dignity, and no scope for disputation concerning his authority.

CHAPTER IX. VER. 1. It was in a mood of mental somnolency, that Hugo de Sancto Caro concluded the 8th chapter with the 38th verse, and carried forward into a new chapter the verse before us. This was not so much to divide Scripture into convenient Lections, as to rend it at random. Well might Grotius say that he "marvelled" at the division, *(miror)*. The verse obviously belongs to the preceding paragraph, and is appended to it by Theophylact,—by Wycliffe too and Tyndale, both of whom commence the 9th chapter with the following verse. Coverdale also does the same: and so did Luther, and Piscator. It aggravates the carelessness of the existing division, that in Matthew the corresponding verse is correctly sundered from what follows, and attached, at the conclusion of the chapter, to what goes before, (xvi, 28). In Luke, on the other hand, the corresponding verse occurs,—such was the waywardness of the Divider,—in the middle of a chapter, (ix, 27).———*And he said to them*:—A favourite form of expression with Mark, when introducing some outstanding or emphatic observation. Its force here might be represented thus,—*and he added*. See chap. iv, 9, 11, 13, 21, 24, 26, 30, 40.———*Verily I say unto you*:—A deep solemnity and earnestness were resting on our Saviour's spirit, when he uttered what follows. Hence the *preliminary* "*verily*," or *prefatory* "*amen*." The whole expression was a peculiarly solemn way of saying *I assure you*.———*That*:—This conjunction should be omitted in our English idiom, as the report of what our Lord said is in *the direct form*. Our translators have generally left it out. Tyndale omits it here, and Luther, and Coverdale.———*There be some of those standing here*:—Note the archaic *be* for *are*. It is Tyndale's word.———*Who shall not taste of death*:—*Of death*, or the *of* may be omitted as in Heb. ii, 9. Wycliffe omits it here. Death is regarded as a bitter poison-potion, which all have, at one time or another, to

that stand here, which shall not [m]taste of death, [a]till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power.

[m] John 8. 52. Heb. 2. 9.
[a] Mat. 24. 34.

---

taste. It is so potent, that to taste it suffices.———*Till they have seen the Kingdom of God come with power*:-Or literally, *in power*, in the possession and manifestation of power. The Kingdom of God, as developed on the earth, might appear to be a feeble little thing, as it pre-existed during the period of our Lord's humiliation; but by and by it would assert for itself a might that would defy every species of criticism or opposition, and eventually shiver into atoms, or grind into powder, every existing institution of ungodliness. Note the word *come*. It is not *coming*, but *having come* (ἐληλυθυῖαν).———Many have found great difficulty in understanding the Saviour's statement. "The verse," says Alexander, "is one of the most difficult and disputed in the whole book." And yet its difficulty arises exclusively from the partial views that have been entertained in reference to our Lord's kingdom and coming. In Matthew xvi, 28, the corresponding expression is, *There be some standing here, who shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom*. If *the coming of Christ in his kingdom* be regarded as applicable only to one definite event, in the evolution of the ages, then the statement must indeed be the most difficult imaginable. We really could not conceive of it having been uttered in the full clear consciousness of a true perspective, stretching away out into the future. It would be a statement that would be apt to shake one's confidence in our Lord's capacity of accurate foresight, and in the reliability of the most solemn of his asseverations. We must hence suppose that while there is undoubtedly some grand culminating *coming*, which is still in the future, and which will sum up into itself all the precursive *comings*, that have afforded to men provisional glimpses and foretastes of its surpassing glory, yet there have been, in actual history, and may yet be, veritable instalments of the consummation. Already in the Old Testament Scriptures, the *coming* of the Messiah is often represented as a unit, or a whole, without the formal distinction of its two great "moments," the *coming to suffer*, and the *coming to reign*. When the prophetic telescopes of the old prophets were turned to *the coming*, the elongated interval, that was to elapse between the beginning and the ending, *lay out of view in their perspective*. Hence Malachi says, "Behold he shall come, saith the Lord of hosts. But who may abide the day of his coming?" (Chap. iii, 1, 2.) That day of his coming is "the great and dreadful day of the Lord." (Chap. iv, 5.) To the prophet's eye *the first coming*, and *the final coming*, looked at in the plane of his perspective, were obviously but two sides of one entirety; and hence, although he does refer to what we call *the first coming*, the coming *that was to be associated with the appearance of John the Baptist* (Matt. xi, 9–14; xvii, 10–13; Mark i, 2, 3) he brings into the same cartoon of representation his reference to what we so often call *his second coming*, "the great and dreadful day of the Lord" that is yet to come. It is on the same principle that the representations of the New Testament are to be interpreted. In the line of the successive manifestations of the majesty and glory of the exalted Messiah, the eye is generally carried forward to the overshadowing grandeur of the

## CHAPTER IX.

*Jesus takes Peter, James, and John with him into a high mountain, where he is transfigured and converses with Moses and Elijah,* 2—8. *He enjoins on them to keep secret what they had witnessed till after his resurrection.* 9. *They were obedient to his injunction, but disputed among themselves wonderingly what could be meant by his resurrection,* 10. *They asked him about Elijah; and the Lord tells them that he had come already,* 11—13. *When he came to the rest of the disciples, he found a crowd, and an uproar of disputation,* 14. *The people hailed his appearance,* 15. *He asked why it was that they were disputing,* 16. *On being informed that his disciples had failed to cure an afflicted demoniac, he was deeply moved, and delivered the lad,* 17—27. *He explained to his disciples what was needed in order to effect a work of that wonderful description,* 28, 29. *He passed through Galilee, and sought to be incognito, for the fatal end was looming in view,* 30—32. *In Capernaum he reprimanded his disciples for disputing among themselves who should be the greatest,* 33—37. *When John*

---

consummation; but, at other times, as here, the view is arrested at some of the intervening illapses of the Heavenly presence and power. Doubtless our Lord referred to the marvellous enlargement, consolidation, and establishment of his kingdom, which was to take place on occasion of the destruction of Jerusalem, and in which there was to be an exceedingly vivid glimpse of the greater future glory. On the occurrence of that destruction, there would occur the annihilation of all the emptied and effete formalities, that were connected with the Jewish temple, and that constituted the chief obstacles to the spread of the Gospel among the Jews, and its chief competitors, in influence, among the Gentiles. The idea of Theophylact, Leo the Great, Hofmeister, Maldonato, A-Lapide, Petter, Richard Baxter, Patrizi, Ryle, and many others, that the reference of our Saviour was to his transfiguration on the mount, just about to be recorded, is exceedingly unnatural. When our Lord says, "*there are some of those standing here who shall not taste death* till they witness the kingdom of God come in power," he evidently refers to a date that was still remote. For the same reason, as well as for others, the reference cannot be, as Cardinal Cajetan, Calvin, and Beza supposed, to our Lord's resurrection and the consecutive events of Pentecost, &c., (See *Commentary on Matthew* xvi, 28.)

## CHAPTER IX.

Verses 2—8, the Transfiguration-section. Compare Matt. xvii, 1—8; and Luke ix, 28—36.

*told him that they had laid an interdict on one who was casting out demons in His name, because he followed not with them, he said "forbid him not,"* 38, 39. *He thence took occasion to add sundry counsels,* 40—50.

2 ¶ AND after six days Jesus taketh *with him* [a] Peter, and James, and John, and leadeth them up into an high mountain apart by themselves: and he was [a] Mat. 17. 1. Luke 9. 28.

---

VER. 2. *And after six days*:-Luke has, *about eight days* (ix, 28). There is no collision. Luke counts the fractional days at the commencement and close of the six complete days specified by Mark and Matthew. The chronological relation of the transfiguration to Peter's confession and the Saviour's consequent manifesto regarding the cross as the steppingstone to the crown, seems to have engraven itself ineffaceably on the memory of the Evangelical reporters. Hence the preciseness of the date in all the synoptic Gospels.———*Jesus taketh with him*:-In the common editions of our Authorized Version,—though not in those of earlier date,—the words *with him* are printed in italic, as if they were supplementary. They are not so, however The *with* is part and parcel of the verb, and the *him* is implied, (παραλαμβάνει).———*Peter, James, and John*:-The elite of the Master's elect,—the triumvirs of the apostolate. Comp. chap. v, 37; xiv, 33. They were sufficient in number to be adequate witnesses to the rest of the apostles, and to men in general. It was seemly not to take a large company. The scene, into which the selected three were about to be introduced, belonged to the sphere of the Saviour's privacy, rather than to the sphere of his public ministry.———*And leadeth them up*:-Literally, *and beareth them up.*———*Into a high mountain*:-That is, *into* some recess in some high mountain. The particular mountain referred to is not specified, and not known. From about the time of Cyril of Jerusalem in the fourth century, it has been popularly regarded as Tabor, a singularly beautiful "dome-shaped mamelon," a little to the east of Nazareth. It stands apart, and is remarkable, says Dr. Tristram, for "its peculiar symmetry of shape." (*The Land of Israel*, p. 125.) Tabor, however, could not be the scene of the Saviour's transfiguration, for the narrative impresses us with the conviction that the spot was secluded, whereas "long before and after the event of the Transfiguration, the summit of Tabor," as Dr. Robinson has shown, "was occupied by a fortified city." (*Researches*, vol. iii, p. 222.) Wilson, Porter, Stanley, and Patrizi, agree with Dr. Robinson that the mountain referred to could not be Tabor. Lightfoot and Reland, even in their day, reached the same conclusion. The hallowed spot was doubtless one of the many highland solitudes in the neighbourhood of Cæsarea Philippi, (chap. viii, 27). "The context of the narrative," says Dr. Porter, "shows that the Mount of Transfiguration is to be sought on the ridge of Hermon." (*Syria*, p. 397.)———*Apart by themselves*:-Literally, *apart alone*, or as Tyndale has it, *out of the waye alone.* It is a somewhat cumulative expression; but its two parts are not simple repetitions of one another. The Saviour might have conducted the three disciples *alone*, and yet other individuals might have ultroneously followed and intruded on their privacy. Our Saviour guarded against this con-

transfigured before them. 3 And his raiment became shining, exceeding [b]white as snow; so as no fuller on earth can white them. 4 And there appeared unto them

[b] Dan. 7. 9. Mat. 28. 3.

tingency, by taking the three *apart*. The word *apart* has by some, as by Norton for instance, been connected, not with the expression *and conducted them alone*, but with the expression *a high mountain*. Hence indeed one of the reasons why Tabor has been fixed on as the scene of the Transfiguration. "It stands on the plain in isolated grandeur," says Dr. Tristram. (*The Land of Israel*, p. 125.) "From these and all the adjoining hills," says Dr. Wilson, "it certainly stands apart; but it is an erroneous criticism, which finds in this circumstance any suitableness for its being the scene of our Lord's transfiguration." (*The Lands of the Bible*, vol. ii, p. 100.)———*And he was transfigured before them*:–Or *transformed;* literally, *metamorphosed*. *Transformed* is Erasmus's word, and Beza's. *Transfigured* is the fine old Vulgate word; it holds its place in all the English versions which preceded the Authorized. Luther's translation is free, *made himself clear* or *bright (verkläret sich)*. Bengel's is more literal, *assumed another form*. So Felbinger's, *was changed in form*. It was a change in the externality of the person,—a kind of temporary glorification effected no doubt from within outward, rather than from without inward. It would reveal the essential glory of the spirit that "tabernacled" within,—its glory at once in that lower sphere that was human, and in that higher sphere that was divine. It would be a prefiguration of our Lord's permanent resurrection-glory. And possibly, therefore, it may be legitimately regarded as an earnest of the glory that is awaiting all, who have become by faith "the members of his body."

Ver. 3. *And his raiment*:–The word is plural in the original, *his garments*,—the Rheims translation. Matthew and Luke draw attention to the transfigured appearance of the countenance. Mark confines his description to the effect of the personal transfiguration on the raiment.———*Became shining*:–Or *resplendent*. Plato applies the word (στίλβοντα) to lightning; Aristotle to the light of the fixed stars. The garments could not conceal the personal glory, but became themselves semi-translucent.———*Exceeding white, like snow*:–When the sun is shining on it in full force. The comparison, however, *like snow*, was probably imported from Matt. xxviii, 3. It is not found in the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts (ℵB), nor in CLΔ, 1, nor in the Sahidic, Coptic (cod.), Armenian, and Æthiopic versions. It is omitted by Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, from their texts; and Griesbach suspected its genuineness. It is not needed. The garments were *exceeding white*, or dazzlingly white, like the glow of white objects when reflecting the rays of a meridian sun.———*So as no fuller on earth can white them*:–Or, more literally, *As no fuller on the earth can so whiten*. Tyndale's Version is good, *so whyte as noo fuller can make apon the erth*, that is, so resplendently white.

Ver. 4. *And there appeared to them Elias with Moses*:–Or, *and there was seen by them Elias with Moses*. Elias with Moses was visible to them. The expression rendered *appeared to* (ὤφθη), is translated *was seen of* in 1 Cor. xv, 5, 6, 7, 8. It is not implied that Elijah and Moses were there, *for the purpose of making themselves visible to the disciples*. They were there for another purpose. But they

Elias with Moses: and they were talking with Jesus. 5 And Peter answered and said to Jesus, Master, it is good for us

---

were not hidden from the eyes of the disciples.——*And they were talking with Jesus*: They were the most illustrious representatives of "the Law and the Prophets," the greatest of the agents who had, in former times, been divinely employed for the establishment and maintenance of "the kingdom of heaven" on earth. That kingdom is the only Real Refuge of humanity. It is the only efficiently aggressive Institution, that is fitted to make way into the domain of the world's dominant wickedness and woes. And as Jesus was the King of the kingdom, there is no wonder that Moses and Elias wished to commune with him, and that he wished to commune with them. Their work had prepared his way. His work was to put the copestone on their labours. ——Was this appearance of Moses and Elijah to the disciples *a vision?* It was (Matt. xvii, 9). That is to say, it was *something seen*. But was it a merely subjective thing? Was it a thing of fancy, woven weirdly out of the woof of their own imaginations? No. It was objective to all the three, and interned within none of them. And doubtless it would become objectively visible to them in the light of Him, who was for the time being so ineffably radiant with his own effulgence. Or we might put the case thus, —They got a glimpse into glory, by reason of their nearness to Him, who was and is, in his own most glorious person, the open Door into heaven.

Ver. 5. *And Peter answered and said to Jesus*:—Namely, when Moses and Elijah were just in the act of departing. (See Luke ix, 33.) The impulsive Peter would fain have detained and retained them on the spot. He is represented as *answering*, although no question had been proposed to him, and no remark was addressed to him. He felt rightly, however, that a revelation had been purposely made to him, and to that he was, in his own impulsive and awkward way, sincerely responsive. —— *Master*: In the original it is *Rabbi*. It would be the common appellation which the disciples employed, when speaking to their Lord. Their standpoint of appellation, as of everything else, was, naturally and inevitably, Jewish. The two words, however, *Rabbi* and *Master (Magister)* correspond almost exactly in their radical signification. (See *Patrizi*).——*It is good for us to be here*: The first ingenuous outburst of the disciple's ravishment. He was witnessing, indeed, only the concluding scene of the sublime spectacle: but he did not know that; and what he did witness entranced him. He had been asleep along with the other two (Luke ix, 32). Weariness had overpowered them. It was late at night. Our Saviour had been engaged in prayer. He had ascended the mountain "to pray." (Luke ix, 28.) It would seem that, as on so many other occasions, he had continued long in aspiration and supplication. He was rapt into the presence of his Father, and wrapt in communion with him. He would gather spiritual strength and recruitment as he continued. He would draw into his recipient humanity more and more of the heavenly influences which were the efflux of the Father's presence. By and by his very body got interpenetrated, and sublimed in some celestial way or other,—"transfigured." He conferred with Moses and Elijah; and just as the conference concluded the disciples awoke, and were filled with overawing wonderment and rapture. Peter

to be here: and let us make three tabernacles; one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elias. 6 For he wist not what to say; for they were sore afraid. 7 And there was a [c] cloud that overshadowed them: and a voice came out of the cloud, saying, [d] This is my beloved Son:

[c] Ex. 40. 34. Lev. 16. 2. Numb. 9. 15. 1 Ki. 8. 10. 2 Chr. 5. 13. 2 Chr. 7. 2. Ezek. 43. 4.

[d] Chap. 1. 11. Mat. 3. 17.

---

gave expression to their common feelings.———*And let us make three tabernacles, one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elias*:—*Tabernacles*, that is, *tents*, or *booths*. Peter would have liked the continuance of the scene. He wished to detain the heavenly visitants; and he thus proposes to provide for their temporary accommodation. He spoke, of course, unadvisedly. "He committed," says Petter, "gross errors and absurdities." But he knew Moses and Elias nevertheless. For, most probably, in the spirit-world, every one's identity will be self-evident. The nature and the name will be coincident. There will be no veils possible, and none needful.

VER. 6. *For he wist not*:—*Wist* or *wissed* is the preterite of a fine old verb *wiss*, still living in German *(wissen)*, and meaning *to know*. It is connected with *wis-dom*, *wise*, *wit*, *wits*. In the Anglo-Saxon version the *not* is combined with the *wist*, in the same way in which *nilled* is the negative of *willed*,—*he nyste*. Coverdale's version is, *he knew not*. But Wycliffe and Tyndale have *he wist not*, and hence our Authorized Version.———*What to say*:—A great improvement on the translation in the Geneva, the Rheims, the Great Bible, Coverdale, and Tyndale,—*what he said*. The original cannot bear to be so rendered, (τί λαλήσῃ, or, as Tischendorf and Tregelles read, τί ἀποκριθῇ). And yet Luther committed the same mistake, and Zinzendorf, and even Principal Campbell and Norton. The expression means, as Beza and Bengel clearly saw, *what he should say*, or, according to the probable reading of Tischendorf and Tregelles, *what he should answer*. Wycliffe was right.—*what he shuld ie seie*. Peter assumed that he should say something, by way of response to the revelation made to the disciples, but he was not sufficiently self-collected, to determine, deliberately and judiciously, how he should express himself.——— *For they were sore afraid*:—Or *they exceedingly feared*, as the word is rendered in Heb. xii, 21, the only other passage in the New Testament, in which it occurs. The meaning is, *they were exceedingly agitated*. And, although a sense of bliss was profoundly pervading their hearts (see verse 5), there was yet whirling around it a feeling of trepidation and awe. The *sore* of our Authorized Version is just the Scotch *sair*, and the German *sehr*,—*exceedingly* or *very*.

VER. 7. *And there was a cloud that overshadowed them*:—Or, more literally, *And there came a cloud overshadowing them*. The cloud *became* (ἐγένετο). Purvey has it admirably, *and ther was maad a cloude overschadewyinge hem*. The effulgence, of which Jesus was the centre, became overcanopied, and the cloud, that overarched them all, gradually settled denser and denser down. The end of the scene was at hand.———*And there came a voice out of the cloud*:—The voice too, as well as the cloud, *became*, (ἐγένετο the right reading). The cloud, within which it formed itself, and out from which it issued, would be a cloud of glory, veiling and shading no doubt all that was aloft, but yet resplendent (Matt. xvii, 5),—a fit symbol of the Divine Presence.———*This is*

hear him. 8 And suddenly, when they had looked [e] round about, they saw no man any more, save Jesus only with themselves.

9 And as they came down from the mountain, [f] he charged them that they should tell no man what things they had seen, till the Son of man were risen from the dead. 10 And they kept that saying with themselves, questioning

[e] Deut. 18. 15.

[f] Mat. 17. 9.

---

*my beloved Son, hear him*: Our Lord thus "received from God the Father," as we read in the Second Epistle of Peter (i, 17, 18), "honour and glory, when "there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, *This is my beloved "Son, in whom I am well pleased.* And this voice, which came from heaven, "we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount." The voice would be timely sustaining to the heart of our Lord Himself; and, as heard by the disciples, would be eminently fitted to strengthen their faith, and predispose them to bow implicitly to the Master's instructions and declarations. (See Deut. xviii. 15.) The highest position of honour and bliss which any human being can occupy is to sit lowly at the feet of Jesus, and "hear him." "Jesus," says Petter, "is the chief Doctor or Teacher of the church; and all Christians ought to hear and obey his teaching." True,—and He is likewise the chief Light of the world, and all men everywhere ought to "see light in His light."

VER. 8. *And suddenly, when they had looked round about, they saw no man any more, save Jesus only with themselves*: Or, *they no longer saw any one but Jesus alone with themselves.* Moses and Elijah had dis-appeared: and, at a certain stage of things, this fact became *suddenly* or *all-at-once* apparent to the overawed disciples. The older English translators, as well as Luther and Principal Campbell, and the authors of the modern Dutch Version (1868), connect the word *suddenly* with the verb *when-they-had-looked-round-about.* Tyndale's version is, *and sodenly they loked rounde aboute them.* Principal Campbell's is, *and instantly looking about.* But our translators, following in the wake of Erasmus and Beza, did well in severing this connection. It is unnatural to suppose that the overawed disciples were eager to look about with suddenness. The *suddenly* is used, in an artless manner, to describe the impression made upon them *after* they had looked round about. *All-at-once* they realized, —what exceedingly surprised them,—that Jesus was "alone with themselves."

VERSES 9—13 constitute a little appendix to the preceding narrative of the Transfiguration. Compare Matt. xvii, 9—13.

VER. 9. *And as they came down from the mountain*:—*Came down*, or as Wakefield gives it, *were going down.* What follows transpired while they were in the act of descending.———*He charged them that they should tell no one what things they saw*:—*Tell*, or *narrate* (διηγήσωνται). Even they themselves did not yet understand what they had seen. Still less could they, in present circumstances, make others understand.———*Till the Son of man were risen from the dead*:—The compound expression, rendered *till*, literally means, as Wakefield renders it, *save when*, or, still more literally, *except whenever* (εἰ μὴ ὅταν),—*except whenever the Son of man should have risen from the dead.*

VER. 10. *And they kept that saying*:—It is only *the saying* in the original, *the*

one with another what the rising from the dead should mean. 11 And they asked him, saying, Why say the scribes that

---

*saying*, namely, which is recorded in the immediately preceding verse,—*the injunction.* Beza strangely understood the word as meaning, not *saying*, but *thing (rem*, eds. 1558, 1598), and referred it to *the fact of the transfiguration.* But the reference is evidently to the injunction.—They *kept* it, or *held it fast.* Such is the import of the verb employed (ἐκράτησαν), and so is it translated in Matt. xxvi, 48; Heb. iv, 14; Rev. ii, 13, 25; iii, 11. It is the same word that is rendered *hold* in Mark vii, 3, 4, 8. They *held* the injunction as a sacred thing, that was not to be tampered with.——*With themselves*:—Our Authorized Translators,—along with the Syriac-Peshito Version, and Euthymius Zigabenus, Erasmus, Luther, Tyndale, Coverdale, Beza, Felbinger, Mill, Wilkes, Lachmann, Ewald, Tregelles, Ornsby,—connect these words with the expression that goes before. Heumann,—though entirely misunderstanding the meaning of the preceding verb,—protested against such a construction as unexampled and unnatural. Dav. Scholz and Fritzsche agree with him, and hence connect the expression with the following participle. So do Hammond, Bengel, Meyer, Lange, Bisping. Rightly.——*Questioning-one-with-another*:—Or, more literally, and as the Rheims has it, *questioning-together.* They *questioned-together with themselves*, that is, they *questioned-together with one another.* The verb is translated *reasoned-together* in Mark xii, 28.——*What the rising from the dead should mean*:—Or more literally still, *What the rising from the dead 'is.'* The three discussed among themselves, in a puzzled mood, what the Master could be referring to, when he spoke of his own rising from among the dead. Things had got into confusion in their minds. *Surely he cannot be referring to what we have hitherto been accustomed to speak of as "the resurrection of the dead." That must still be in the far future. But he seems to be speaking of something that is to to take place soon, and while we ourselves are living;—something too in which he himself is to be implicated. We cannot understand what he means. And yet it must be of a momentous nature, for he spoke of it with awful solemnity.*

Ver. 11. Probably the Saviour, after having charged his disciples not to divulge the scene of the transfiguration, until after his resurrection, stepped on before, wrapped in his own contemplations. The disciples, falling behind, would then, in mingled awe and perplexity, ventilate among themselves the Saviour's meaning; and, at the same time, no doubt, they would be, with unwavering fealty, encouraging one another, to keep the secret which had been committed to their trust. But by and by their thoughts take another turn, though into a strictly adjacent field, and they make up to the Master to state their difficulty.——*And they asked him, saying, Why say the scribes that Elias must first come?*—There had been many debates among the people as to who Jesus was, and whether or not he might not be, notwithstanding the humility of his appearance, the Messiah promised to the fathers. The scribes were positive in maintaining the negative,—for this among other reasons, that Elijah had not yet reappeared, according to Malachi's prediction (iv, 5). There seemed, at first sight, to be some force in the objection. And certainly if the resurrection of the just were to take place soon, it would be very wonderful indeed if Elijah should not make his appearance "before the

[g] Elias must first come? 12 And he answered and [g] Mal. 4. 5.
told them, Elias verily cometh first, and [h] restoreth [h] Mat. 4. 6.
all things; and how it is written of the Son of man, that

---

coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord."—*Why?*—Such is the general rendering of the term employed by the evangelist (ὅτι; Lachmann prints it ὅ τι;). It is a fragmentary interrogative, admirably appropriate in the mouths of questioners, labouring under a feeling of diffidence. Ewald, however, regards it as being simply "recitative," and therefore to be left untranslated in English and German, *And they questioned him, saying, The scribes say, Elias must first come.* But this interpretation is not so natural as the other.—Tischendorf, instead of the single expression *the scribes*, reads *the Pharisees and the Scribes*, under the authority of the Sinaitic manuscript and the Vulgate Version. The authorization is not sufficient.

VER. 12. *But he said to them* (ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτοῖς):—Such is the simple reading of Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford. It is the reading of both the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts, and of CLΔ.———*Elias verily cometh first, and restoreth all things*:—According to the prediction in Malachi iv, 5, 6. He *restoreth all things*, so far as issuing a new order of the day is concerned,—an order involving a return to first principles. In his preaching he puts all things to rights. He shows what should be. He shows what should not be. If his preaching were to be practised, the way would be admirably prepared for the highest prosperity and glory of the Israelites, and the ultimate regeneration of the whole of mankind. The wounds and divisions of society would be healed. "The heart of the fathers would be turned to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers." The reform would spread from the family-circle to all the other circles of society. Man would be heartily united to man.—Webster-and-Wilkinson correctly note that the expression which describes the advent of Elias is not, in the original, *coming*, but *having come* (ἐλθών). If we could, in our English idiom, have said *coming*, instead of either *coming* or *having come*, the reproduction of the evangelist's phrase would have been complete. We cannot however. And our translators have admirably accommodated our English idiom to the Greek,—*Elias verily cometh first 'and' restoreth all things*. The use of the conjunction '*and*' sufficiently indicates that the "restoration of all things" *follows after* the "coming first."—The word *verily* is somewhat heavy as a rendering of the original particle (μέν). *Indeed* would not be quite so heavy. But the original vocable has no analogue in English. It finely bends the mind forward, in expectancy, toward some complementive fact that remains to be stated.———*And* (καί):—This conjunction introduces the complementive fact, though the evangelist, in employing it, departs, *so far as form is concerned*, from the mode of representation which is initiated in the preceding clause. Form apart, what the conjunction introduces is something to be taken *on the other hand*, in relation to what goes immediately before.———*How it is written of the Son of man*: A phrase which has, as Fritzsche expresses it, "vehemently harassed interpreters." He himself thinks that the reading of the existing manuscripts is in a state of hopeless confusion. Beza too was perplexed to the last degree. Daniel Heinsius, however, seems to have hit upon the true method of interpre-

he must [i] suffer many things, and be set at nought. [i] Gen. 3. 15. Psalm 22.
13 But I say unto you, [j] That Elias is indeed Isaiah 53. [j] Mat. 11. 14. Luke 1. 17.

---

tation. He puts an interrogation-point at the close of the clause,—*And how stands it written concerning the Son of man?* Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Lange, accept this interpretation. The Saviour wished the disciples to couple with the fact concerning Elijah, another fact concerning the Messiah himself. It was a fact of the greatest moment,—though utterly ignored by the Pharisees. The Saviour excites his disciples' attention to it, by introducing it interrogatively, *how stands it written concerning* (literally *upon*) *the Son of man?* As to the expression *stands it written?* or *is it written?* or *has it been written?* see on chap. vii, 6. The Saviour answers his own question as follows.———*That he should suffer many things, and be set at nought*:—To lose sight of the sufferings of the Messiah, and of his rejection by the mass of the people, was to lose sight of one of the most obvious and important features of Old Testament prophecy. The word aptly rendered *set-at-nought* (ἐξουθενωθῇ) is exceedingly graphic and emphatic. Our Saviour was to be *treated out and out as if he were Nothing at all.* He was not only to be ignored: he was to be ignored with the utmost possible contempt. See the predictions in Psalm xxii and Isaiah liii.—The expression *'that' he should suffer*, if very literally rendered, would be *'in order that' he should suffer*. Our Saviour's very presence on the earth was *in order that he might suffer*. He came *when* he came, and *as* he came, and *where* he came, in order that he might face the very difficulties, and endure the very trials, which were now to rise up around him in these circumstances, while engaged in the prosecution of his great undertaking. Over and above his more general aim, which would not have been modified in whatsoever age, and in whatsoever sphere, he had appeared, *he came to enter that particular sphere and arena, and to sacrifice himself there.*

Ver. 13. *But I say unto you*:—A solemn and autocratic way—becoming in our Lord—of giving utterance to an important idea or truth.———*That*:—It is the *recitative* '*that*,' and may be omitted in translation, as has been done by Wakefield, Meyer, Ewald.———*Elias is indeed come*:—A free translation. The particle rendered *indeed* is the common conjunction that means *and* or *also* (καί). Many translators, such as Luther, Tyndale, Coverdale, omit it altogether. And many interpreters, on the other hand, have supposed that it looks forward to the *and* in the beginning of the following clause, *and they have done unto him what they listed.* They would accordingly translate it *both*, as if the meaning were as follows,—*It is the case, 'both' that Elias has come, 'and' that they have done to him what they listed.* So Edgar Taylor and Norton translate. The Vulgate translator, and Erasmus Schmid, and de Wette, seem to have taken the same view, *(et—et).* But if such a relationship of the clauses had been the idea of the evangelist, we should have expected, as Meyer observes, another order of his words, (καὶ ἐλήλυθεν Ἠλείας). It is more likely therefore that the particle tacitly glances at Another One who had come,—*Elias 'too' has come.* The disciples were certain that the Messiah had come. He was standing before them, and speaking to them. Jesus assures them that *Elias also had come.* In the Rheims the translation is, *Elias also.* Principal Campbell's

come, and they have done unto him whatsoever they listed, as it is written of him.

14 [k]And when he came to *his* disciples, he saw a great multitude about them, and the scribes ques- [k] Mat. 17. 14. Luke 9. 37.

---

version is, *Elijah too.* Bishop Hammond puts it well,—"He is come *as well as I.*"———*And they did to him what they listed*:-That is, *what they desired.* Compare the German *Lust.* The two English words, *list* and *lust*, were originally one, and one with the German word, and meant *desire* or *wish.* The leading Jews, in dealing with the New-Testament-Elijah, John, did not take into account for a moment *what God wished.* They only considered what was agreeable to their own feelings. And it was agreeable to their feelings to pay little regard to his spiritual instructions while he prosecuted his ministry at large, and to use no influence to get him liberated, after Herod had laid hands upon him.———*As it stands written concerning him*:-Literally, *upon him.* It is an idiom, in English also, to speak of *writing 'upon' a subject.*———But where, it has been often asked, is there anything written in the Old Testament Scriptures concerning the treatment which John, as the New-Testament-Elijah, was to receive? Grotius ingeniously says that since the prophet speaks of John as Elijah, *he leaves it to be understood that Ahabs and Jezebels would not be wanting.* There was, hence, he would conclude, a virtual prediction of John's maltreatment by Herodias and Herod. Wetstein takes the same view,—*It stands written concerning John*, he says, *in the history of Elijah, who typified him.* So Elsner. Meyer acquiesces. So do the authors of the new Dutch Translation. Patrizi actually thinks that the pronoun *him* refers not to John at all, but *to Elias his type.* Fritzsche says that the view of Grotius and Wetstein is "the most *tolerable*" that has been suggested. But it appears to be more "tolerable," and natural, to admit that Mark was no purist in composition, and that his mind was resting on the chief assertion, *Elias too has come*, although he had let drop interveningly the secondary statement, *and they did to him what they listed.* Robert Stephens took this view of the matter, and hence, in his 1550 and 1551 editions of the New Testament, enclosed within parenthesis the intervening clause. He was followed by the authors of the Rheims Version, and by le Clerc in his Latin New Testament. In his French Version, le Clerc omits the last clause altogether. Le Cene, Mace, and Principal Campbell transpose the clause into the middle between the two preceding clauses. Campbell gives the verse thus,—*But I tell you that Elijah too is come, as was predicted, and they have treated him as they pleased.* This is too great freedom. And the brackets are too artificial. But the conception that underlies both the expedients is substantially correct. It was also Bengel's conception, and Du Veil's.

VERSES 14—29 contain a paragraph parallel with Matt. xvii, 14—21, and Luke ix, 37—43. The narrative of Mark, however, is much fuller, and more vivid, than the accounts of the other synoptics.

VER. 14. *And when he came to the disciples, he saw a great crowd around them*:-In the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts, and the Armenian Version, the expression runs thus,—*and when 'they' came to the disciples, 'they' saw a great crowd around them.* It is more likely, however, that the reading of the

tioning with them. 15 And straightway all the people, when they beheld him, were greatly amazed, and running to *him* saluted him. 16 And he asked the scribes, What

---

Received Text is the original.———*And the scribes questioning with them*: Or rather, *and scribes disputing with them.* There is no article before the word *scribes.* As to the phrase, *disputing with them,* see chap. viii, 11, and chap. ix, 10. It is the translation of Purvey, Tyndale, Coverdale, and the Geneva.

VER. 15. *And immediately all the crowd, when they saw him, were greatly amazed*:–Why? A debated matter. Some have supposed that their amazement arose from seeing his countenance, like that of Moses, supernaturally radiant from the effects of the transfiguration. Both Euthymius Zigabenus and Theophylact, as also John Wesley, make mention of this opinion, without however deciding for it. Bengel and de Wette favour it. Whitby and Wynne adopt it. But inconsiderately. For Mark does not mention at all, in his account of the transfiguration, the radiance of our Lord's countenance. And he does mention that our Lord expressly enjoined on the three favoured disciples, to keep the fact of the mountain-glory a secret. We may be sure, therefore, as Elsner remarks, that our Lord would not carry with him, on his own person, the visible tokens of what had transpired. We must look in another direction for "the reason why." The Lord's *opportune appearance* seems to have struck the people with amazement. The disciples had got into a great difficulty. They were at their "wits' end." They had failed in an attempt to effect a cure. Their failure had been signal and conspicuous. The scribes—ever lying in wait to detect flaws—had taken advantage of their discomfiture to ride roughshod over their humiliated feelings; and no doubt they would be improving the opportunity to throw discredit on the name of the Master himself. Very likely they would be insinuating that it was a matter of good policy for him to be out of the way, when a case that would really have tested his power of wonder-working was to turn up. The imbroglio of insinuation, disputation, crimination, and recrimination, had just reached its climax, when lo, in the "very nick of time," the Saviour made his appearance, walking calmly along in the direction of the scene of contest. This is the view that has been generally entertained in reference to the *great amazement* of the people. It is sufficient. Instead of *greatly amazed,* Wells translates the word, *overjoyed.* Unwarrantably, however. Wakefield renders it, *surprised.* Also unwarrantably. *There was surprise;* but it was superlative in degree.———*And running toward him, saluted him*:–They hailed his advent with the greatest respectfulness and delight.

VER. 16. *And he asked the scribes*:–Or, according to the reading of the modern critical editors, *and he asked 'them,'* that is, *the people in general.* As the Saviour advanced into the thick of the hubbub of disputation, he viewed collectively the general crowd, instead of disintegrating it into *scribes* and *the rest.* The Sinaitic, Vatican, and Cambridge manuscripts (ℵBD), along with LΔ, 1, and the Vulgate, Coptic, Armenian, and Æthiopic versions, read '*them.*' Mill had no doubt at all that *them* must be the autographic reading. Griesbach and Fritzsche were of the same opinion. But all three of these critics differed as to the reference of the pronoun. Mill supposed that it referred to *the disciples* alone, and that the second clause of the verse should be rendered thus, *what*

question ye [1]with them? 17 And one of the multitude answered and said, Master, I have brought unto thee my son, which hath a [l]dumb spirit;

[1] Or, *among yourselves.*
[l] Mat. 12. 22. Luke 11. 14.

*dispute ye* '*among yourselves*,' for, says Mill, *they had no doubt begun to dispute among themselves. (Prol.* §. 406.) Griesbach supposed that it referred to *the disciples and the scribes*, and hence he too would translate the second clause of the verse in the same manner with Mill. Fritzsche again espoused the view that had been taken by the very ancient annotator, whose annotation now forms part of the *Textus-Receptus*. He supposed that the reference is to *the scribes*, and that the second clause of the verse should therefore be rendered as in our Authorized Version. It is far more probable, however, that the reference of the pronoun is, indefinitely, to the people in general, as distinguished from the disciples.——*What question ye with them?* Or rather, *What dispute ye with them?* Or the phrase might be rendered thus,—'*Why' dispute ye with them?* that is, *Why dispute ye with my disciples?* He would be already in the midst of the disciples when he spoke, as one of their company, so that his reference to them would be manifest. *Why this uproar? Why those keen and biting words, which fell upon my ears, as I approached?* As to the verb rendered in our Authorized Version *question*, see on Chap. viii, 11, and ix, 10, 14. It is rendered *dispute* by Purvey, Tyndale, Coverdale, and in the Great Bible, and the Geneva. As to the general import of the interrogation, compare a corresponding phrase in Chap. viii, 17.—*With them*:—In some important manuscripts, inclusive not only of the Alexandrine (A), but also of the Sinaitic at first hand (ℵ*), the expression is reflexive (πρὸς ἑαυτούς) and means *with one another*, as Mill and Griesbach understood it. The other reading, however, (πρὸς αὐτούς), is the best supported, and the reference is no doubt to the disciples. Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles support it.

Ver. 17. *And one out of the crowd answered and said*:—Or simply,—according to the reading of the Sinaitic, Vatican, and Cambridge manuscripts, and 33 "the queen of the cursives,—*answered him.*——*Master*:—Literally, *Teacher*, that is, *Rabbi.*——*I have brought my son*:—Or rather, *I brought my son*, (ἤνεγκα). The father was not referring to an action that was just completed as he spoke, but, indefinitely, to an action that was now among things past.——*To thee*: It was *to thee* that I wished and intended to apply in his behalf, though, when I arrived, I found thee not.——*Who has a dumb spirit*: That is,—according to a common idiom, *who has a spirit that makes him dumb.* The poor lad was a demoniac, and the demon had deprived him of the use of the affiliated organs of speech and hearing. (See ver. 25). There is nothing incredible in such power, if evil spirits there be at all. Even some 'men' have power to deprive, for the time being, some of their fellow-men of speech, hearing, feeling, seeing; and what marvel, then, that unincarnated spirits should have a corresponding power? There are assuredly in existence, as W. G. Palgrave says, "malignant cosmical influences, be they what they may." *(Central and Eastern Arabia*, vol. ii, p. 273.) "The spirit-world," says Delitzsch, "good as well as bad, has been in all times the background of the events that transpire on earth." *(Bib. Psychologie.* p. 22.) As to demons, and their influence, see on Chapter i, 23, 32.

18 and wheresoever he [m] taketh him, he [2] teareth him: and he [n] foameth, and gnasheth with his teeth, and pineth away: and I spake to thy disciples that they should cast him out; and they could not.

[m] John 8. 3.
[2] Or, *dasheth him.*
[n] Jude 13.

---

Ver. 18. *And wheresoever he taketh him*:—Instead of *he*, it would be better to use the neuter pronoun *it*,—the pronoun actually employed by our translators in the 22d verse. In both verses, Wycliffe, Coverdale, and the Geneva, have *he*. But the modern translators, in both cases, employ the more appropriate *it*.—*Wheresoever* (ὅπου ἐάν):—The right translation, giving the adverb its proper *local* import. Erasmus and Coverdale take the word in its rare *temporal* import, *whensoever*,—but without any good reason. It is never used *temporally* in the New Testament. The expression *it taketh him* is somewhat ambiguous in English. It might be supposed to mean, *it conducteth him*. But it really means, *it seizeth him*, that is, *taketh hold on him*. The word in the original (καταλάβῃ) is the term from which we have our pathological word *catalepsy*. No doubt the poor afflicted lad would be an *epileptic*, and, during his epileptic seizures, he would be *cataleptic*.———*It teareth him*: Such is the literal meaning of the evangelist's term (ῥήσσει). It is a natural description, from a primitive standpoint, of the *convulsions* to which epileptics are subjected. Something seems to be *tearing*, or *tearing at, them*. In the margin the term is rendered *dasheth him*,—the Rheims translation. Purvey's corresponds, *hurtlith hym down*. They both reproduce the Vulgate Version *(allidit illum)*, which corresponds with the Peshito-Syriac. Euthymius Zigabenus gives the same interpretation to the term. Hesychius too gives it, in his Lexicon, as one of his interpretations of the term. Fritzsche approves. With some reason; and yet the evangelist's term is more generic, and exhibits, as it were, a more primitive attempt to represent the action that results in the dashing of the poor sufferer to the ground.———*And he foameth*:—Principal Campbell, having rendered the preceding clause, *dasheth him on the ground*, freely renders this, *where he continueth foaming*. And no doubt the evangelist intends to describe the progress of the symptoms consequent upon seizure.———*And gnashes with his teeth*: More literally and simply, *and gnasheth his teeth*, or *grindeth his teeth*. The word *gnash* is onomatopoetic, and is painfully expressive, as is also Luther's word *knirschet*, and the corresponding word in all the Dutch versions *knarst*, as also the Gothic word in the Version of Ulfilas, *kriustith*.———*And pineth away*:—Literally, *and is becoming dried up*, like a *withering* thing. The word is rendered *wither away* in Matt. xiii, 6; xxi, 19, 20; Mark iv, 6; xi, 21. It graphically represents that wasting condition of the body, which results in a haggard appearance. Celsus mentions that while the *morbus comitialis*, or *epilepsy*, is commonly not "perilous to life," it nevertheless sometimes "consumes the man." (*De Medicina*, iii, 23.) Euthymius Zigabenus misunderstood the reference of the evangelist's expression. He supposed that it describes the *insensibility* that is the concomitant of the attacks in detail. Principal Campbell had a corresponding idea,—"where he continueth foaming, and grinding his teeth, *till his strength is exhausted*." Heinsius and le Cene blundered remarkably over the phrase. They thought that it had reference to the demon, and denoted the termination of the attack.

19 He answereth him, and saith, [o]O faithless genera- [o] Deut. 32. 20. Psa. 78. 8. Heb. 3. 19.
tion, how [p]long shall I be with you? how long shall I [p] 2 Pet. 3. 15.

---

They would translate it, *and departeth.*———*And I spoke to thy disciples, in order that they might cast it out, and they were not able*:–They had actually tried, but had failed.

VER. 19. *He answered*:–There is a conjunction in the original,—the conjunction that is appropriate for the expression of a counterpart fact or idea, (δέ). Principal Campbell renders it here *thereupon;* Mace, Newcome, Edgar Taylor, Norton, *then.*———*He answered him and saith*:–Instead of *him*, it is *them* in the oldest and most important manuscripts, such as ℵABDLΔΠ, 1, 33. Griesbach, consequently, and also Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, have replaced *them* in the text. Mill, in his day, approved (*Prol.* §. 1493). And, no doubt, as being by far the more difficult reading, it must be the autographic. Our Saviour did not direct his remarks, in the first place, to the father of the afflicted lad. He spoke *to the crowd in general*, as embracing all the different parties; and, as he spoke, he realized that they were but representatives of a far larger crowd. His spirit spread itself out over *the population in general.* See the following words. The expression however, is not, *he answered and saith to them.* It is *he answered them and saith.* In the Received Text, and indeed in all Stephens's editions, there is a comma before the clausule, *and said.* The Saviour, thus, is represented *as turning himself responsively to the crowd in general, and the population in general, and then saying what follows.* He looks, as it were, at the prevailing state of mind, as if it had been vocally expressed to himself. It had in it a relation of challenge or defiance, which was as real as actual speech.———*O faithless generation*:–Or rather, according to our modern idiom, *O unbelieving generation!* Such is the translation of the Vulgate, Ulfilas, Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Beza, le Clerc, Bengel, Newcome, Pr. Campbell, Sharpe, Lange, Rilliet. It is not unlikely, however, that the word *faithless* was used by our Translators in its primary import, *destitute of faith*, that is, *unbelieving.* The original term was generally translated by them *unbelieving*, or *not believing*, or *infidel.* See 1 Cor. vii, 12, 13, 14, 15; x, 27; xiv, 22, 23, 24; 2 Cor. vi, 14, 15; 1 Tim. v, 8; Rev. xxi, 8. Note too the contrast in John xx, 27, "Be not *faithless*, but *believing.*" The cognate noun, moreover, is always translated *unbelief.* (Matt. xiii, 58; xvii, 20; 1 Tim. i, 13; Heb. iii, 12; &c.) In the passage before us the Geneva has *faithless;* and so has Cromwell's Bible. But Tyndale and the original Geneva (of 1557) have "O generation *without faith*," which corresponds to Wycliffe's *out of bileve*, that is, *out of belief*, or *without belief.* The Saviour lamented the unbelief of the generation,—their unbelief in relation to himself, their unbelief in relation to his Father.———*How long shall I be with you?*–I have come *to* you (πρός), how long shall I require to remain in the relationship thus established, ere the end of my mission be realized? How long shall I require to be *with* you, ere you get to know me, and the Father?—*How long*:–Literally, *until when?* At what point of time will there be a prospect of my mission being understood?———*How long shall I suffer you?*–If the force of the verb were very literally given, the interrogation might be expressed thus, *How long shall I 'hold-myself-up'*

suffer you? bring him unto me. 20 And they brought him unto
him: and when he saw him, straightway the spirit tare him;
and he fell on the ground, and wallowed foaming. 21 And
he asked his father, How long is it ago since this came unto
him? And he said, [q]Of a child. 22 And ofttimes
it hath cast him into the fire, and into the waters, to

[q] Job 5. 7.

---

*in relation to you?* That is, *How long shall I tolerate you? How long shall I bear with you?* The Saviour speaks as from a divine standpoint, and realizes that there are limits to divine forbearance.———*Bring him unto me*:–How full and unwavering his consciousness of divine power!—The verb *bring* is in the plural (φέρετε), so that the father, while specially referred to (Luke ix, 41), is not exclusively addressed.

VER. 20. *And they brought him to him*:–*They,*—the excited people would eagerly take part with the father.———*And when he saw him*:–"It is possible," says Bleek, to regard the subject of the seeing as the demon, and not the demoniac. It may be "possible," but it is extremely improbable; for (1) the last clause of the verse, running in a corresponding groove, must refer to the demoniac; and (2) the gender of the participle, which is rendered *when 'he' saw* (ἰδών), is at variance with the supposition.———*Straightway the spirit tare him*:–Or, *convulsed him*, or, better still, *the spirit immediately threw him into convulsions.* Such is the appropriate rendering of Mace, Worsley, and Pr. Campbell. (Compare Plutarch's expression, κραυγὰς σπαραγματώδεις, *convulsive shoutings*, or, *paroxysms of vociferation. Op.* vol. ii, p. 130, C.)——— *And he fell on the ground, and wallowed foaming*:–*Wallowed* or *rolled (himself.)* The word *wallowed* (connected with the Latin *volvo*) just meant to *roll.* The expression in Matt. xxvii, 60, that is rendered in our version, *and he 'rolled' a great stone to the door of the sepulchre,* is rendered by Wycliffe thus,—*and he 'walowid to' a grete stoon at the dore of the biriel.* See also Mark xv, 46.

VER. 21. *And he asked his father, How long ago is it since this happened to him*:–"*This,*" that is, *this* affliction.—"*Since* this," or more literally, "*when* this;" exceedingly literally, "*as* this." Compare the German *als.* As to the final end of the Saviour's asking, we certainly do not need to seek it in our Saviour himself. (See John vi, 6.)———*And he said, From a child*:–That is, *from childhood*, or rather, as Richard Watson remarks, *from boyhood.* In the oldest and best-supported reading of the original phrase, there is a pleonasm (ἐκ παιδιόθεν), somewhat corresponding to our English pleonastic phrase *from thence.*

VER. 22. The father of the lad continues. *And ofttimes it hath cast him*:–Tyndale has, *casteth him;* literally, *(it) threw him.* The father thinks of particular instances.———*Into (the) fire*:–There was no article in the text that was lying before our Translators, and there is none in the best manuscripts and critical editions. It is found, however, in the Alexandrine manuscript; and Bengel and Fritzsche have introduced it into their texts.—*Into fire*:–Not simply *into 'the fire' at home;* but, indeterminately, *into fire,* when he happened to be near it; and, it might be, in various places. In the original the expression is *both into fire,*—the mind being thus prepared for a reference to some other

[r] destroy him: but if thou canst do any thing, have compassion on us, and help us. 23 Jesus said unto [r] John 8. 44. Rev. 9. 11.

---

dangerous element.———*And into (the) waters*:–The article here too is wanting, even in the Alexandrine manuscript, and in Bengel. It is foisted in, however, by Fritzsche; wilfully. The lad had been precipitated at various times, and in various places, *into waters*, or *into water*, as Wycliffe renders it. Tyndale and Coverdale also use the singular number. There is something both singular and plural in water. The many drops or droplets run together into unity. In Hebrew the word for *water* is plural only.———*In order to destroy him*:–The father recognized demonic malice in the seizures.———*But if thou canst do anything*:–The afflicted parent was not sure whether such an aggravated case was within the reach or scope of the great Healer's power. He did not question, indeed, that Jesus was a wonderful Healer. But there was, he seems to have thought, a peculiarity in his son's particular case, that made it doubtful whether even so wonderful a Healer could do anything that would be adequate to remove, or even to alleviate the affliction. In short he did not understand Jesus as the Son of God, and the Saviour of men,—their Saviour both inwardly and outwardly.———*Have compassion on us, and help us*:–The "us" is touching. The father, with beautiful benevolence of love, identifies himself instinctively with his son. He felt that whatever was done to his son, was done to himself.

VER. 23. An exceedingly important verse, but, to many minds, beset with difficulties, both critical and doctrinal.———*But Jesus said to him, If thou canst believe*:–This word *believe*, though apparently so indispensable, is wanting in both the Sinaitic and Vatican Manuscripts (ℵB), and in the Parisian Ephraemi ($C^*$); as also in LΔ, and 1. It is wanting likewise in the Coptic, Armenian, and Æthiopic Versions, and in $k^*$ of the Old-Latin Version. Griesbach thought that it was "probably" spurious; and Tischendorf and Tregelles have actually omitted it from their texts. Neander approved of the omission (*Life of Christ*, §. 187); and so do Ewald and Meyer. No doubt, rightly. For although, at first sight, when the word is left out, the Saviour's answer seems cut short of significance at its very commencement, yet, when we look deeper, we see that there is a fine subtle significance that is blurred out of sight by the presence of the word. In the original the neuter definite article (τό) stands before the expression, so that, very literally, the Saviour's reply runs thus, *The If thou canst (believe),—all things are possible to him who believeth.* The presence of this article changes the whole aspect of the case; for if the word *believe* be retained, the article is a stumbling block. It puzzled the writer of Beza's old manuscript (D), who hence left it out altogether. It puzzled Beza too, so that he actually turned the sentence right round,—*If thou canst believe 'this'* (viz., *that I can help thee*). Krebs, again, regarded it as forming no part at all of our Saviour's reply, but as standing before it, fingerpost-wise, after the manner of its use in Luke i, 62; ix, 46; xxii, 2, 4, 23, 24, 37; Acts xxii, 30; 1 Cor. iv, 6. Lösner and Kuinöl agree with Krebs. Their interpretation would be so far legitimate, if we could conceive any reason that might have led the evangelist to give a special emphasis to this reply of our Saviour, as distinguished from the many other replies that were made by

him, If thou canst believe, [s] all things *are* possible to him that believeth. 24 And straightway the

[s] Mat. 17. 20. Mark 11. 23. Luke 17. 6.

him on other occasions. Fritzsche imagined that the text must be corrupted. Lachmann *(Preface to 2nd vol. p. vii,)* was of the same mind, and proposed a modification of reading (πιστῶσαι), *make certain the (uncertain)* '*If thou canst.*' Burton, accepting the text, and the Received reading, would remodel its import by a peculiar punctuation and accentuation,—*Believe what you have expressed when you said If thou canst,* (Τὸ, Εἰ δύνασαι, πίστευσαι). Sir Norton Knatchbull and Grashof had the same idea regarding *believe* (that it was an imperative in the middle voice); but they took a simpler view of the remainder of the expression. This verb, however, in its New Testament usage, never occurs in the middle voice. D. Heinsius proposed as an emendation of the text, that, instead of the article *The* (Τό), we should read the interrogative *What?* (Τί;). But there would be no end to conjecture, if conjecture were to be the order of the day. All real difficulty vanishes when we accept the reading of the oldest manuscripts, and omit the word *believe.* Then the Saviour's answer fastens upon the unbelieving expression which the man had employed,—"but *if thou canst* do anything." Taking hold of that expression, the Saviour draws the man's attention to it, and thence starts immediately in the direction of the ability that was really indispensable. It is as if he had said,—"The *If thou canst* "is a phrase which should not have been used by thee in relation to me. "It is in truth applicable only to thyself; for *all things are possible to him who* "*believeth.*" The Saviour refrained from *spreading out* his rebuke. He only *suggested* it, by holding up to view the man's own phrase, and then abruptly turning from it to the condition, on which, in all ordinary cases, his special favours were suspended. There is therefore a kind of *break-off,* or *aposiopesis,* at the conclusion of the articulated expression,—"The *If it be possible to thee.*—All things are possible to him who believeth." It is almost as if an exclamation-point were employed,—"The *If it be possible to thee!*—All things are possible to him who believeth." Tischendorf employs an interrogation-point,—"The *If it be possible to thee?*" It is as if he would interpret thus,—"Did you really say so?" Ewald also brings out the idea interrogatively,—"*What? If thou canst?*" The recent Dutch Translators (1868) give the same interrogative rendering, only omitting the preliminary *What?* Griesbach disliked the interrogative form, but explains, in substantial accord, as follows,—"Thou saidst, "*If it be possible for thee.* With the highest possible right do I throw back to "thee that expression; for there is nothing that is impossible to him who "finds it possible to believe." *(Comment. Crit.* in loc.) Wetstein had substantially the same idea, though he did not see clearly how to work it out.——— *All things are possible to him who believeth*:—The expression does not mean, in this connection, *It is possible for the believer to 'do' all things,* but *It is possible for the believer to 'get' all things.* Omnipotence is, in a sense, at his disposal. But the universality of things contemplated by our Lord was not, as the nature of the case makes evident, the most absolute conceivable. We must descend in thought to *the limited universality of things that would be of benefit to the believer.* We must, indeed, descend still farther. We must consider the benefit of the believer not absolutely, or unconditionally, but relatively

father of the child cried out, and said with tears, Lord, I believe;

---

to his circumstances, and thus relatively to the circumstances of the other beings with whom he is connected. With these limitations, — inherent in the nature of the case,—"*all things*" *are possible for him that believeth.* But why, it has often been asked, for only *him that believeth?* Why insist on *faith* from the afflicted father, and from others in corresponding circumstances? Why not dispense favours of health, with indiscriminative generosity, on *believing* and *unbelieving* alike? *It was because faith in the fact of Christ's divine power or authority, or, at all events, in the propitiousness which is involved in that fact, is, in the nature of things, absolutely necessary to the enjoyment of the highest 'spiritual' blessings.* Being, in the nature of things, thus necessary in that high spiritual sphere, it was wise that our Lord should, by a positive enactment or determination, make it, in all ordinary cases, a prerequisite for obtaining his peculiar favours in all inferior spheres. He thus, in the material department of his work, held up the mirror to the spiritual; and flashed light on the inner by the reflective power of the outer. He made his visible life a parable of high invisible realities. It was the perfection of symbolism.

VER. 24. *And straightway the father of the child*: Note the expression *the child.* It is a diminutive in the original, so that we may conclude that the sufferer was *but a "lad."* The first Geneva, and the Rheims, render the word, *boy.*———*Cried out*:-He was profoundly agitated, and hence spoke in a loud and earnest way, with vehemence of intonation.———*And said with tears*:-It would appear that the expression *with tears* has crept into the text from the margin. It is wanting in the three most important manuscripts, the Sinaitic, Alexandrine, and Vatican, (ℵ A B), as well as C* L Δ; and in the Coptic, Armenian, and Æthiopic versions. It is left out of the text by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles; and is not needed. Meyer and Ewald approve of its omission.———*Lord*:-This too has been carried in from the margin. It is wanting in *all* the best manuscripts, inclusive of ℵABCD, as well as in the Syriac versions, and the Gothic, Coptic *(Schwartze's ed)*, and Armenian *(Zohrab's ed)*. Even Griesbach and Scholz omit it.———*I believe*: The poor man, looking eagerly and excitedly from the standpoint of his great trial, caught a glimpse of the divine glory that was radiating from the personality of Jesus. *Yes, I believe!* He exclaimed his faith.———*Help*—or *succour*—*mine unbelief*:-"A prayer," says Martin Bucer, "most needful *(perneccessaria)* for us all." Yet it is rather a peculiar expression. Does it mean *Help me against my unbelief.* So Dr. Adam Clarke explains it,—"assist me against it." Ryle too, who says, "What shall we do with our unbelief? We must *resist it*, and pray against it." Doddridge gives the same explanation; and Rodolphus Dickinson introduces it in his Translation,—"Fortify me against unbelief." But this can scarcely be the exact idea. It seems to be one thing to *help unbelief*, and another to *help 'against' it.* Wesley looked at the expression from quite a different standpoint. He explained it thus, "although my faith be so small that it might rather be termed unbelief, yet help me." He thus did not regard the suppliant as supplicating for increase of faith. This explanation was the alternative interpretation of Bengel. It was also Grotius's

[t] help thou mine unbelief. 25 When Jesus saw that the people came running together, he rebuked the

[t] Psa. 40. 17. Psa. 46. 1. Psa. 71. 12.

---

idea, who thinks that "it is scarcely credible that the man could have expected from Jesus,—and in particular suddenly,—an augmentation of faith." Principal Campbell agrees with Grotius, and follows Mace in his version. Meyer too, in all his editions, adheres to the same interpretation,—*Deny me not thy help, notwithstanding my unbelief.* So Bleek, and also Webster-and-Wilkinson. But this view of the expression, notwithstanding the eminence of its supporters, seems far-fetched and strained. It is more likely that the man, while exclaiming "I believe!" realized, as he spoke, that his belief was but struggling, as it were, into existence. It was merely a rudimentary thing, scarce worthy of the name of belief. It was not defiant infidelity indeed. Far from that. It was not deliberate and self-complaisant antagonism to faith. Far from that. But still there was more of what was negative in it, than of what was positive. While, when looked at on one side, it might be called *belief*, yet, when looked at on another, it was rather *unbelief*, though unbelief in the throes of transformation into belief. Hence many interpreters, such as de Lyra, Dionysius à Ryckel, Petter, Trapp, Kuinöl, Holden, Bland, Grashof, Alexander, Burger, explain the word as the man's own depreciatory expression for his *weak* or *imperfect faith*. The man was probably in the very act and agony of a vital change. And hence, at the moment that he caught a glimpse of the divine power of Jesus to succour the disordered body, he also caught a glimpse of his equal power to succour the disordered soul. He therefore prays him on his own behalf. But Wynne, surely, misunderstood the prayer, when, on a principle of cool reflectiveness, he interpreted it thus,—"Remove my doubts by performing the cure, which will strengthen my wavering faith." Yet le Clerc gives the same interpretation.———Calvin seems to look upon the *faith* and *unbelief* here mentioned, as the two permanent foci in the ellipse of all Christian experience, and hence he extends the application of both parts of the expression to all Christians. He says, "As their *faith* is never perfect, it follows that they are partly *unbelieving*." "This," says Richard Baxter, "is, alas, the case of most Christians." Note the "alas," for Alexander goes too far when he says, "The reply itself is one of the most beautiful on record, even in the Gospels." See next verse.

Ver. 25. *But* (δέ) :—Tyndale and our Translators did wrong in omitting this conjunction. It is rendered *now* by Coverdale and Luther. Wycliffe and the Rheims, following the Vulgate, render it *and*. Bengel, more literally, has *aber*, that is *but*.———*When Jesus saw that the people* :—*The people*, or rather, *the crowd*, (ὄχλος). In the texts, however, that were lying before our Translators the phrase was not *the crowd*, but simply *(a) crowd*. And hence Young and Godwin have *a multitude*. But both the Sinaitic and Alexandrine manuscripts have the article, and Tischendorf has introduced it into his 8th edition.———*Came running together* :—Or more literally, *comes running together*. The object seen is, as it were, *directly* represented,—*But when Jesus saw*—(this to wit)—*The crowd comes running together*. The verb rendered *comes running together* (ἐπισυντρέχει) is freely thus rendered, though Liddell-and-Scott, give, in their Lexicon, the same import,—"*to run together to* (a

foul spirit, saying unto him, *Thou* dumb and deaf spirit, [u] I charge thee, come out of him, and enter no more into him. 26 And *the spirit* cried, and [v] rent him sore, and came out of him: and he was as one dead; insomuch that many said, He is dead. 27 But Jesus

[u] Mark 1. 25.
[v] Mark 1. 26. Rev. 12. 12.

---

place)." So too Robinson in his Lexicon. Also Erasmus, Grotius, Beza. The verb is unknown in classical Greek. But one should suppose, on the principle of analogy, that the first preposition would denote *addition*, (see Fritzsche),—*But when Jesus saw the crowd running together more and more*, viz. in the direction of himself. Bretschneider, in the first and second editions of his Lexicon, explained the word as Liddell-and-Scott have done. In his third and last edition he combined—unwarrantably—the two forces of the preposition. Schleusner overlooked the force of the preposition altogether. And so did Wahl in the 1st and 2nd editions of his Lexicon, but he explained it correctly in his third.———*He rebuked the foul spirit*:—In every other passage in the New Testament,—with the exception of the penultimate clause of Rev. xviii, 2,—the adjective, here rendered *foul*, is translated *unclean*. The demons were all *morally impure*. See on chap. i, 23.———*Saying to it, Thou dumb and deaf spirit, I charge thee*:—Or, as Wycliffe and the Rheims give it, *I comaund thee*. The spirit is called *dumb and deaf*, because dumbness and deafness were two of the characteristic results of its occupancy. "The demon," says Delitzsch, "stood related to the dumbness and deafness, as cause to the effect." *(Bib. Psychologie*, §. 16, p. 296.)———*Come out of him, and enter no more into him*:—It was thus not merely deliverance from the present epileptic seizure, which the Saviour granted. It was deliverance from liability for the future to all similar attacks and the other calamities involved in "possession."———It will be noted that it is not said that the Saviour wrought the miracle here recorded, because of his high approbation of the state of mind, that was manifested by the afflicted father. Compare Matt. viii, 10—13; Mark vii, 29. Exorbitant ideas of the excellency of that state of mind have been entertained by Alexander and others, as if it were the *beau ideal* of true spiritual self-consciousness and humility. But it is another motive-cause of action that is brought into view by the evangelist. It was *when the Saviour saw the multitude gathering rapidly, in yet denser crowds*, that he cut short his interview with the agitated man and delivered his son.

VER. 26. *And after it cried, and severely convulsed him, it came out (of him)*:—Our translators added the words *of him* from the Vulgate. They were not in the Greek text, or in the Geneva, or in Tyndale; and they are not needed.———*And he became as dead, so that the people in general said* (or *say*), *He is dead*:—The phrase rendered *many* by our Translators is literally *the many* (τοὺς πολλούς), that is, *the multitudinous persons, the multitude*. The meaning is, in such a case as this, *the mass of the people*. Rilliet, too antithetically and enumeratively, renders the phrase *the greater part (la plupart)*; and Alford, *the more part*. It is not needful to suppose that there was much of a formally comparative estimate of the numbers of two distinct parties.

VER. 27. *But Jesus took him by the hand*:—Or, according to the reading of the Sinaitic, Vatican, and Cambridge manuscripts (ℵBD),—a reading received

took him by the [w] hand, and lifted him up; and he arose.

[w] Isai. 41. 13. Mark 5. 41.

28 And [x] when he was come into the house, his disciples asked him privately, Why could not we cast him out? 29 And he said unto them, This kind can come forth by nothing, but by [y] prayer and [z] fasting.

[x] Mat. 17. 19.

[y] Eph. 6. 18. Jas. 5. 16.

[z] 1 Cor. 9. 27.

---

into the text by Lachmann, Tregelles, and Tischendorf,—*But Jesus took hold of his hand.*———*And lifted him up*:–Or rather, *and aroused him, awoke him* as it were *to consciousness.* He infused into his frame a divinely reviving and healing energy.———*And he arose*:–Namely, to his feet, "perfectly whole and sound" (Petter).

Ver. 28. *And after he entered into (the) house*:–There is no article before the word *house* in the texts that were lying before our Translators; and it is wanting in almost all the best manuscripts, and in all the critical editions. Still the meaning is not exactly, *into a house*,—the rendering of Wycliffe, Wakefield, Norton, Godwin. The idea is, *after he was housed*,—*after he had retired from the outside crowd.* And no doubt the Saviour would be domiciled just in '*the*' *house*, where he had been lodging for the time being. Compare chap. ii, 1; iii, 19; vii, 17.———*His disciples asked him privately*:–After they had got to be with their Lord, by themselves.———*Why* (ὅ τι or ὅ, τι) *were we unable to cast it out?*–They had made the attempt, and had failed, though in other cases they had succeeded. See chap. vi, 13.

Ver. 29. Mark seizes the culminating point of what was reprehensibly deficient in the disciples. Compare Matt. xvii, 20, 21. *And he said to them, This kind* :–Not, *this kind of faith*, as le Cene strangely supposes; nor *this kind of unbelief*, as Sieffert as strangely supposes (*Ursprung*, pp. 100, 101); nor *this kind of beings* (namely the whole tribe of demons), as Fritzsche, Bleek, and Alexander suppose; but *This kind of demons, this kind of peculiarly determined and malicious demons.* For, among evil spirits, as among evil men, there are varying degrees of energy, determination, and malice. They are not all cut and clipped after one precise model.———*Cannot come forth*:–Or *go out*, as it is rendered in Wycliffe, Coverdale, and the Rheims. It '*cannot*' *go out*, that is, it *cannot be compelled to go out.*———*By anything except by prayer and fasting*:–Not pathologically, on the part of the demoniac, as Paulus fancied, but propaedeutically on the part of the exorcist. It is not meant, however, that *faith* might be omitted (Matt. xvii, 20). Neither is it meant that faith must be merged in prayer and fasting. It is meant that faith must be in maximum degree, and that, consequently, those spiritual exercises, which condition its highest attainable exaltation, must be realized. *There must be prayer*,—the uplifting of desire till it settle in the will of God. *There must be fasting*,—the denying of all, in the periphery of self, that would hinder the uprising of the desire to God, or its absolute repose in his will. When the desire reaches the will of God, and, entering into it, settles itself there, it has laid hold of omnipotence. No wonder, therefore, that "all things are possible" to the faith that goes along with it. No wonder that "mountains" are "removed." No wonder that the promise is illimitable,—"Ye shall ask *what*

30 And they departed thence, and passed through Galilee; and he would not that any man should know *it*. 31 For he taught his disciples, and said unto them, [a] The Son of man is delivered into the hands of men, and they shall

[a] Chap. 8. 31.

---

*ye will*, and *it shall be done unto you*." (John xv, 7; Compare Mark xi, 23, 24.) It is into *the will of God* that the desire has risen. Hence subjective caprice is excluded. And thus, if not always in the physical sphere, yet always in the moral sphere, demons the most inveterate are cast out, mountains the most frowning are swept aside, and miracles the most marvellous are achieved. ———It is remarkable that in the Sinaitic and Vatican Manuscripts (ℵB) the words *and fasting* are wanting, and Tischendorf has left them out. Meyer condemns them. The authorization, however, is not sufficient. But even if it were overwhelming, *fasting* would, *in its essence*, be implied.

Verses 30—32 form a little appendix to the preceding paragraph. Compare Matt. xvii, 22, 23; Luke ix, 43—45.

Ver. 30. *And they departed thence*:—From the neighbourhood of the Mount of Transfiguration, the district of Cæsarea Philippi. See Chap. viii, 27. ———*And passed through Galilee*: Literally, *And passed along through Galilee*. They did not tarry much at any particular place. Tyndale's translation is, *and toke their iorney thorow Galile*.———*And he did not wish that any one should know*:—He wished to be really, and not merely technically, incognito. For the reason, see next verse. The expression, in the original, brings *aim* into view (*ἵνα τις γνοῖ*). Our Lord had no wish that involved within it, as an aim, that he should be known. In other circumstances he might wish and aim, and no doubt often did wish and aim, to be known: but not now.

Ver. 31. *For he taught his disciples*: The verb is in the imperfect, *he was teaching his disciples*. And as it was on this teaching that his heart was set, he sought seclusion. In teaching his disciples, he was teaching the teachers of the world.———*And said to them, The Son of man is delivered into the hands of men*: *Of men*, mark. He refers to the chief priests and elders and scribes (see chap. viii, 31); but he chooses here to merge the specific representation in the generic,—"of *men*." There is a gleam of antithesis in the generalization. Our Lord realized his own essential superiority to *men*. Note the present tense, *is delivered*. He has gone forward in thought into the approaching future, and is present there. He sees it all as vividly as if it were actually present. *Delivered*, viz. by his own traitorous disciple. The word is translated *betrayed* in Matt. xvii, 22; xx, 18; xxvi, 2, 21, 23, 24, 45, 46, 48; xxvii, 3, 4; John vi, 64; xiii, 11, 21; xxi, 20. But in all these places, as here, it really means *delivered*, in the sense of *delivered up*, that is, *given up*. To *deliver*, indeed, properly means to *free from*, and thus *to set at liberty*. A De*liver*er is one who gives *liber*ty. But when a captor gives liberty to his captives, and hands them over to the people with whom he had been at variance, he puts them, in freeing them, *under the control of others*. Hence the secondary meaning of the word *deliver*,—*to give up to the control of another*. It was in this sense only that Jesus was *delivered* by Judas.———*And they shall kill him*:—Instead of welcoming him as the Son of God, they will murder him. The verb used (*ἀποκτενοῦσιν*) is of intense import,

kill him; and after that he is killed, he shall rise the third day. 32 But they [b] understood not that saying, and were afraid to ask him.

[b] Verse 10.

33 [c] And he came to Capernaum: and being in the house he asked them, What was it that ye

[c] Mat. 18. 1. Luke 9. 46.

---

*to kill off.*———*And after that he is killed, he shall rise*:–Literally, *he shall rise up*, that is, he shall rise up from the prostrate condition of death. In substance, therefore, the idea is, *he shall rise again*, and so the word is rendered by Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, the Geneva, and the Rheims, as also by the great majority of the modern translators.———*The third day*:–In the most ancient manuscripts, and the most modern critical editions, the expression is, *after three days*. It has the same meaning as the expression in the Received Text. See Chapter viii, 31. As the expression in the Received Text is the form of the phrase in Matt. xvii, 23, it seems to have commended itself to some early transcriber as the more precise or perspicuous way of putting the idea.

Ver. 32. *But they understood not that saying*:–It is simply *the saying* in the original. Erasmus translates the phrase freely, *what he had said*. Principal Campbell's version is also admirable, though free, *what he meant*. In accepting it, we might then revert to a still more literal rendering of the verb,—"But they knew not what he meant." To us, looking backward, the meaning of the prediction is as clear as sunlight. But when the disciples looked forward, from their standpoint of Rabbinical anticipation, no utterance could appear more enigmatical.———*And were afraid to ask him*:–To inquire of him, to question him. They were "afraid." Mace far too freely renders it *ashamed*. Principal Campbell, influenced by Mace, uses a still more objectionable word, *shy*. It was not a case of mere *shyness*, or even *shame*. They saw clearly that some dark cloud was lowering. The Master's mind was profoundly affected. Billows of "a sea of troubles" were dashing in upon him. Their hearts were like to fail them for fear; and they dreaded to look, with inquisitiveness, into what was impending. They remembered too the strong words that had been uttered to Peter, when he ventured to remonstrate. See chapter viii, 33. Thus *they feared to make inquiry.*

Verses 33—37 form a paragraph corresponding to Matt. xviii, 1—5, and Luke ix, 46—48. It is peculiarly interesting as containing evidence of the historical impartiality of the disciples. They did not suppress from their memorabilia of the Saviour what reflected discredit on themselves, if it served to reflect their Master's excellence or glory.

Ver. 33. *And he came to Capernaum*:–Or, as it runs in the Sinaitic, Vatican, and Cambridge manuscripts (ℵBD), *and 'they' came to Kapharnaum*: the Lord, to wit, and his disciples. Mill approved of the plural reading, and it has been introduced into the text by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles. The little company, in passing southward from the region about Cæsarea Philippi, at length arrived at Capernaum — our Lord's headquarters in Galilee. See chapter i, 21.———*And being in the house*:–Or rather, as it stands in Lord Cromwell's Bible (1539) *and when he was come into the house*, (ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ γενόμενος). Tyndale's version is, *and when he was come to housse;*

disputed among yourselves by the way? 34 But they held their peace: for by the way they had disputed among themselves, who *should be* the [d]greatest. 35 And he sat down, and called the twelve, and saith unto them, [e]If any man desire to be first, *the same* shall

[d] Luke 22. 24.
[e] Chap. 10. 43. Mat. 20. 26.

---

but the phrase *to house*, though idiomatic in German, has not grown into an English idiom. Coverdale's translation is more idiomatic, but still not quite satisfactory, *and whan he was at home*. The expression informs us that our Lord deferred questioning his disciples until he was once more domiciled in the house where he was accustomed to reside when he was living in Capernaum.———*He inquired of them, What was it that ye disputed among yourselves by the way*:–Or, *What were you discussing in the way*, or *on the road?* The expression *among yourselves* is omitted in the manuscripts ℵBCDL, and in the Vulgate and Coptic Versions, and in a great majority of the Old-Latin codices. It is left out by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford. Our Saviour did not make the inquiry in order to get information. (See verses 34—36.) He made it in order to prepare their minds for certain ideas which he wished to communicate.

VER. 34. *But they held their peace*:–Or, as Coverdale has it, *they held their tunges*. Mace and Campbell, with exact literality, render it, *They were silent*. Shame sealed their lips.———*For they discussed with one another by the way*:–In the original, the expression *with one another* occupies a position of emphasis, by standing at the commencement of the clause,—*for with one another they discussed on the road*. They had allowed a question, which should have been kept for ever far away from the hallowed enclosure of their fellowship, to get within their little circle.———*Who (should be) the greatest*: Literally, *Who (should be) greater*, viz. than the rest,—who should occupy the chief position under the king,—the position of prime minister, as it were,—in the kingdom that was about to be inaugurated. It is not likely that each of the disciples would put forward a claim to the primacy. There was a Triumvirate that stood out conspicuously, and the rest of the disciples would probably be divided, for the time being, into cliques of partizans. We need not suppose, indeed, that the rivalry had been very strongly "pronounced." But it existed; and the discussion to which it gave rise had been unhappy.

VER. 35. *And having seated himself*:–The Saviour was going to deal with the matter as a Teacher, solemnly.———*He called the twelve*:–To come close to him. See Matt. xx, 32; Luke xvi, 2; xix, 15; Acts x, 7. They had probably been engaged with their individual concerns; or, they might be clustering in groups, which somewhat represented the cliques into which they had broken up.———*And saith to them, If any one wishes to be first, he shall be last of all, and servant of all*:–This whole clause is regarded as apocryphal by Volkmar; and it is wanting in Beza's celebrated manuscript (D), now in Cambridge. It is, however, manifestly genuine. Instead of *he shall be* (ἔσται), the San Gallensis manuscript (Δ), and a good many others of lesser note, read, *let him be* (ἔστω). And many interpreters, who accept the common reading,—that of the Received Text, and also of the Critical texts,—interpret the expression after the mind of the San Gallensis transcriber. Petter, Wakefield, Worsley,

be last of all, and servant of all. 36 And he took a child, and set him in the midst of them: and when he had [f] taken him in his arms, he said unto them, [f] Chap. 10. 16.

---

Wesley, Rodolphus Dickinson, translate the phrase, *let him be.* Calvin gives the same translation as an alternative rendering *(qu'il soit).* Heumann and Newcome have, *he must be.* And so, substantially, Luther, Meyer, Grashof, Lange, and expositors in general. They regard the entire apophthegm as coincident in import with Chap. x, 43, 44, and Matt. xx, 26, 27. And so it is, undoubtedly, in substrate of idea at least. It would be quite possible, indeed, to understand the expression, as denoting the penal result of ambition. In the estimation of the Highest, he who seeks to be first shall be the last and least. But, on the whole, it is more likely that our Lord was designedly uttering, in a somewhat enigmatical way, the great principle of promotion in the kingdom of heaven,—*If any one in my kingdom wishes to be first,—(to be,* says Cardinal Cajetan, not *to appear to be,* not *to be held to be,* but *to be)—he shall not seek the pre-eminence in the usual way. He shall seek it in the reverse way. He shall go down, and be the last of all and the servant of all.* He shall ascend descendingly, and thus descend ascendingly. It is not necessary, indeed, that a man think untruths regarding himself, and his mental endowments or other talents. But it is necessary, if a man would be a Christian, that he do not make himself his own end. He must not coil himself on himself, and terminate himself in himself. He may ascend over others; but not for himself. He may also descend below others. He must. But not for himself. His selfhood must not take a circuit, just to get back to itself. It must not go round about, in order to reach itself by and by, enriched with the results of a wide-spreading sweep. The great sociological law of the kingdom of heaven is not this,—*Use thyself for thyself.* Still less is it this, *Use others for thyself.* But it is this,—*Use thyself for others.*

VER. 36. *And he took a little child, and placed it in the midst of them*:-Acting a parable. The action seemed to say,—*Look there! In that child you have a charming picture of an unambitious spirit. I wish you not to be 'childish;' but I wish you to be 'childlike,' so far as ambition is concerned. Why should any one seek to be uppermost? or to gain an advantage over all the rest? It is surely nobler to give than to get. This child is not thinking of using us for the sake of its self. Its whole soul is beaming forth with fulness of unselfish love upon us all!* ———*And after taking it up in his arms*:-This is a graphic touch which Mark alone preserves. The Saviour felt impelled to lavish his love on the little one. He "*embraced*" it, in the literal sense of the word,—*folding it within his arms.* (French,—*embrasser*, from *bras* the "arm," Lat. *brachium).* The old corresponding Saxon word, *beclyppan*, has for long dropped out of use,—though Wycliffe retained it in the passage before us,—*whom whanne he hadde byclippid.* (To *clip*, now, is to bring a thing within the arms of scissors or shears.) Luther's word is fine, *herzete; he pressed the child to his heart.*———*He said to them*:-No doubt among other remarks. See Matt. xviii, 3—5. The evangelist goes rapidly on with his narrative, only touching, as he passes, certain points and peaks of biographical events and remarks.

37 [g]Whosoever shall receive one of such children in my name, receiveth me: [h]and whosoever shall receive me, receiveth not me, but him that sent me.

[g] Mat. 18. 5.
[h] Mat. 10. 40. Luke 9. 48.

38 [i]And John answered him, saying, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and he followeth

[i] Luke 9. 49.

---

VER. 37. *Whosoever shall receive one of such little children*: Or, *If any one should receive one of such little children* (ὃς ἂν—δέξηται). *Of such little children* is the reading of Lachmann and Tregelles, as well as of the Received Text. Tischendorf reads *of these little children*, under the authorization of the Sinaitic manuscript (ℵ) and CΔ, &c. It is an unimportant variation.—*Shall receive*:—To his house or his heart. An orphan child, for instance. But it is possible to receive to the heart, when it is impossible or unnecessary to receive to the home. And what is applicable to the literal child is just as applicable to the intellectual or spiritual child. Compare verse 42; Luke xvii, 1, 2.——— *In my name*:—Literally, *upon my name*, that is, *on the ground of my name, influenced by regard to my name*. We should lay emphasis on this expression. The Saviour is thinking only of actions that are associated *with his name*. Kindness, *unlinked to his name*, is not at present taken by him into account. But what if, nevertheless, it be implicitly connected? What if all, that is beautiful and good in man, be but some reflected rays from the beauty and goodness of the Ideal Man? The Saviour, however, is here speaking of *explicit* recognition. Hence his use of the word *name*. His *name*, indeed, apart from Himself, would be but an empty sound, sign, or symbol,—something not worth knowing. But Himself, apart from his name, would be The Unknown. We cannot think of objects, which are beyond our senses, but by means of names. ———*Receiveth me*:—The Saviour will take what is done to the child "for his name's sake," as done to Himself. Compare Matt. xxv, 40.———*And whosoever receiveth* (δέχηται ℵBL) *me, receiveth not me, but him who sent me*: *Not me*, as separated from the Father. The man's action does not find its terminus in Christ. It goes farther, and terminates on the Great Father. So that the will of him who receives Christ is in harmony with the Infinite Will. His heart beats in sympathy with the Infinite Heart.

VERSES 38—40 contain further particulars of the conversation that is referred to in verses 33—37. Compare Luke ix, 49, 50.

VER. 38. *And John answered him, saying*:—In the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts, as also in Δ, and the Peshito-Syriac Version, and the Coptic, the word *answered* is omitted. The expression simply runs thus, *John said to him.* Tischendorf and Tregelles have introduced this reading into their texts. It is more likely, however, that the Received Text is genuine. It is the more difficult of the two readings. Jesus had not asked any question, which needed to be *answered.* But when he said, *Whosoever shall receive one of these little ones in my name, receiveth me,* John's mind got a gleam of light, and his conscience smote him. And hence, in response to the idea expressed by his Lord, he "took words" and spoke.———*Master*:—That is, *Rabbi*, literally *Teacher.* ———*We saw one casting out demons in thy name, who followeth not us*:—*One*, or *a certain (individual).* The expression, *who followeth not us*, implies, *firstly*, that the individual referred to *did not follow Jesus*, as one of his personal

not us: and we [j] forbad him, because he followeth [j] Num. 11. 28.

attendants and pupils (Luke ix, 49); and, *secondly*, that he *did not follow* "*the Twelve*," as one occupying a subordinate position to theirs. There were individuals who *followed the twelve*,—pious women for example, and, most likely, others. The individual here referred to, though probably not even of "the Seventy," was no doubt one who had listened, at some time or other, to Jesus, and had faith in him as the great Deliverer. Petter arbitrarily says, "he was faulty, in not being so forward as he should have been in following Christ." Richard Baxter too speaks of him as "faulty." So does Matthew Henry,—"I know of nothing that could hinder him from following them, unless he was loath to leave all to follow them; and if so, that was an ill principle." But it was not to be expected that all who listened to our Saviour's words, and believed on him, should leave their respective vocations and homes, and "itinerate" in the company of our Lord's personal attendants. Our Lord wished, and had chosen, a limited number of "itinerant" followers. The great majority of the rest, his inward followers, would require to adorn the doctrine of godliness in their local spheres, and in the management of their private and personal affairs. Some, however, would have peculiar gifts, and would hence be called to peculiar spheres of service. The individual here referred to had one of those gifts,—*he had power over evil spirits, and could exorcise them.* We know that there were such individuals in our Saviour's time, even among those who had never had any external connection with him. See Matt. xii, 27. We know also that there were many in later times, as there had been before, who professed to be possessed of exorcistic power. Justin Martyr says, in his *Apology to the Roman Senate*, "Many of our people, the Christians, by using "adjuration in the name of Jesus Christ, who was crucified under Pontius "Pilate, have cured, and are still curing, in Rome and throughout the world, "multitudes of demoniacs, whose cases had utterly baffled all other exorcists." (Chap. 6.) In his *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew* (chap. 85), he affirms that while exorcism, as practised by the Jews, failed, when the adjuration was "by kings (such as Solomon), or saints, or prophets, or patriarchs," and often failed when the adjuration was simply "by the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob," it was emphatically successful when administered "by the name of the Son of God, who was born of a virgin and crucified under Pontius Pilate." Then, says he, "every demon is overcome and subdued." There would however, we may be sure, be many mountebank pretenders to exorcistic power. See Acts xix, 13, 14. And some perhaps, on the other hand, would have real power, who knew nothing outwardly of Jesus. Josephus witnessed the marvellous feats of a professed exorcist, called Eleazar, who performed in the presence of the emperor Vespasian. See *Antiq.* viii, 3, 5. It is not incredible that, in certain peculiar idiosyncrasies and circumstances, incarnated spirits should have power to a certain extent over unincarnated spirits. It is but the reverse of the obverse fact, so often referred to in the New Testament, that unincarnated spirits have power, to a certain extent and in certain idiosyncrasies and circumstances, over spirits that are incarnated. The generic phenomenon is, *that spirit has power over spirit in many subtle ways, not yet explained by science.*——*And we forbad him*:—We *prohibited* him.

not us. 39 But Jesus said, Forbid him not: for [k]there [k] 1 Cor. 12. 3.
is no man which shall do a miracle in my name, that can lightly

---

Very literally, *we hindered him*, viz. so far as blaming him, and insisting on his abandonment of the exercise of his gift, were concerned. Comp. Numb. xi, 28. ———*Because he followeth not us*:–Tischendorf, under the sanction of the manuscripts ℵBΔ, reads *because he was not following us* (ἠκολούθει),—an unimportant variation. Mill rejected the clause altogether (*Prol.* §. 407), and Fritzsche cuts it off because of the "intolerable loquacity" which it ascribes to John. It is no doubt genuine however.—Note the "*us*." Although no exegetical emphasis is lying on it, yet it is well to read it with some doctrinal intonation. It is the point, at which the principle of exclusiveness crops up,—that spirit of intolerance that so easily develops itself into fagot-and-fire. It was rife in the Jewish nation. It had been rife among other peoples. And although it was nipped in the bud by the Saviour, the moment it sprang up among his disciples, yet by and by it rose again within the circle of Christendom, and grew into a upas tree that spread its branches, and distilled its blight, almost as far as the name of Christ was named. The tree still stands, alas,—though many a noble hatchet has been raised to cut it down. It stands; but the hatchets have not been plied in vain. It is moribund. And here and there some of its larger boughs have been lopped off, so that the sweet air of heaven is getting in upon hundreds of thousands of the more favoured of those who were sitting in the shadow of death. "Better a thousand times," says Ryle, "that the work of warring against Satan should be done by other hands, than "not done at all. Happy is he who knows something of the spirit of Moses, "when he said, *Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets*, and of Paul, "when he says, *If Christ is preached, I rejoice, yea and will rejoice* (Numb. xi, 29; Phil. i, 18)."

VER. 39. *But Jesus said, Forbid him not*: The Great Master had no sympathy with that exclusive spirit, which was the germ of ecclesiastical persecution. The expression, *prohibit him not*, has been perplexing to some, inasmuch as the man was already prohibited. Petter says,—"His meaning is, they should not forbid him any more hereafter, nor yet any other that should attempt the like in the same manner." We are probably to explain the injunction, on the common rhetorical principle, that the scene, in which the disciples encountered the exorcist, was summoned up before the imagination, as if it were present. When we penetrate beneath the rhetorical form of the expression, we find in it both reproof for the past, and direction for the future. ———*For there is no one who will do a miracle in my name*: Or literally, *upon my name*, that is, *resting upon my name*. See on verse 37. The word translated *a miracle* (δύναμις) properly means *power*. Wycliffe renders it *vertu* (virtue); Luther, *a deed (eine That)*; Bengel, *a mighty deed*. It is often, when used in the plural, rendered, in our Authorized Version, *mighty works* (Matt. xi, 20, 21, 23; xiii, 54, 58; xiv, 2, &c.); also, *mighty deeds* (2 Cor. xii, 12); and *wonderful works* (Matt. vii, 22). *Miracle* is Tyndale's and Coverdale's word. So too Piscator, *ein Wunder*. It is a *miracle* that is meant, but a miracle, not considered as *an object of wonder*, but regarded as *a manifestation of power*.———*That can lightly speak evil of me*:–Literally, *and*

speak evil of me. 40 For [l]he that is not against [l]Mat. 12. 30.
us is on our part. 41 For [m]whosoever shall give [m]Mat. 10. 42.
you a cup of water to drink in my name, because ye belong

---

*will be able quickly to speak evil of me.* The verb translated *speak-evil-of* is rendered *curse* in Chap. vii, 10, and Matt. xv, 4. It is the exact antithesis of the frequently-recurring verb that is rendered *to bless* (εὐλογέω). Instead of *quickly* (ταχύ), or *soon*, as Wycliffe and Coverdale have it, Tyndale introduced the free translation *lightly*. The idea is, that if any man be conscious of exerting, either in an extraordinary or in an ordinary way, a great and beneficent influence, through the name of Jesus, *it will take a considerable time*, to say the least of it, before his mind can become so altered, that he would either speak or think depreciatingly of the "worthy name," in which he has found a source of power and blessing. Nature, as Leibnitz and other thinkers used to say, does not advance *by leaps*. And mind, too, even when in the act of transition and conversion,—in either an upward or a downward direction,—never takes *an entirely sudden leap.*

Ver. 40. *For he that is not against us, is for us* :-Note the social *us*. The Saviour graciously associates his disciples with Himself. On another occasion (Matt. xii, 30) he said, *He that is not with me is against me.* The two apophthegms are but the obverse and reverse of one idea. *There is no neutrality in relation to Christ and Christianity.* He who is not with them is against them. He who is not against them is with them and for them. For, in all the spheres of things moral, there is no belt of borderland between right and wrong. He who is not good is bad. He who is not bad is good. In the highest sphere, Christianity and goodness are identical. Christ is impersonated Goodness. And thus the great law of No-neutrality comes into operation. *He who is not with Christ is against him: He who is not against him is with him and for him.* When, in Applied Morals, we sit in judgement on ourselves, we should, in ordinary circumstances, apply the law obversely and stringently,—*He who is not with Christ is against him.* But when we are sitting in judgement on others, into whose hearts we cannot look directly, we should, in ordinary circumstances, apply the law reversely and generously,—*He who is not against Christ is with him and for him.*

Ver. 41. *For*:-In the apophthegm of verse 40, there is a substantial return to the sentiment of verse 37, and hence this ratiocinative *for*, while strictly referring back to the immediate antecedent, implicitly refers farther back to the remoter antecedent in verse 37. But Burton puts this latter link of connection too strongly, when he says, "The 41st verse seems to be connected "*immediately* with *v.* 37; our Saviour's discourse about the child having been "interrupted by the question put by John." Du Veil however took the same view; and Patrizi takes it strongly.———*If any one should give to you a cup of water to drink*:-An inexpensive gift, but most precious and delicious, especially in such a thirsty climate as that of Palestine.———*In my name*:-Having thought of me, and regard for me. Note the *my*. It is recognized as genuine by Tregelles, and at length too by Tischendorf. It is in the Sinaitic manuscript. It had been given up by Griesbach, Lachmann, Scholz. By Fritzsche too, and Meyer; and also by Tischendorf in his 1849 and 1859

to Christ, [n]verily I say unto you, he shall not lose his reward. [n] Mat. 25. 40.

42 And [o]whosoever shall offend one of *these* little ones that believe in me, it is better for him that a [o] Mat. 18. 6. Luke 17. 1.

---

editions. It is no doubt genuine. And yet the Saviour was no egotist. He did not attribute, to the extent of one particle, too much importance to himself. Neither did he intend to depreciate acts of kindness that had no explicit reference to himself. No one was so ready, as he, to appraise at their true value such embodiments of love. But instead of referring, for the present, to generic *acts of kindness*, he refers, for a special purpose, to such as were done *for his name's sake*. See on verse 37, and compare Matt. x, 42, where the same seed-thought was sown on another occasion.———*Because ye belong to Christ*:–Or, as it is more simply in the Rheims, *because you are Christ's*. The word *Christ* is here used as a proper name, and yet with its significance unmerged. *They belonged to the Messiah*. The expression is epexegetical of the preceding *in my name*. But it does not suggest, specifically, *following*, or *discipleshood*, or *service*: the relationship indicated is generically *possession*. ———*Verily I say unto you, he shall not lose his reward*:–The action is worthy and rewardable, and shall therefore obtain reward. Not that there is anything in it, that should, or could, be erected on a high pedestal of merit. But being right and good, God will smile on it.

Ver. 42. See Matt. xviii, 6, and Luke xvii, 2.———*And whosoever shall offend*:–Or, as the idea of the original might be expressed, *And if any one should offend*. It is not possible to reproduce the original phrase to a nicety. The word *offend*, too, does but scant justice to the original term, (σκανδαλίση). It is rather, as Jonathan Edwards remarks (*Notes*, in loc.), *cause to offend*,–– Edgar Taylor's version. But neither is that the exact idea. The Rheims version is *scandalize*,—a mere anglicising of the original word, in despair of otherwise doing it justice. So too the French Geneva, in such editions as 1562, 1606, 1616, 1710. Calvin also, in his French version, uses the same word; and Martin, Osterwald, Rilliet. These all followed in the wake of the Latin Vulgate. But not only is *scandalize* not a translation; the term, in so far as it has become a denizen of our English language, has obtained a signification, that is quite aside from the idea intended in the passage before us. Le Clerc renders the word, *make to fall*. Mace, *cause to transgress*. Norton, *cause to fall away from me*. But Principal Campbell has hit on the proper translation, *insnare*. The Greek *scandal* was the stick of a trap, which, when struck, sprang and insnared the animal. *Men are 'insnared' when they are 'caught tripping.'* They are *caught tripping*, when they go where they should not go, and touch what they should not touch. "If any one," says Calvin, "trips through our fault, or is turned aside from the right path, or retarded, "the Scripture says that we *scandalize* him."———*One of these little ones who believe in me*:–The Saviour has passed in thought from the literal child to the childlike,—the childlike not merely in spirit, but in experience and intellect. There are little ones, intellectually, in the family of the Great Father. Tyndale uses the one word *lytelons*. Note that the Saviour says *one of these lytelons*,—even *one*, "though," says Petter, "it be the least or meanest

millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were cast into the sea.

43 [p] And if thy hand [3]offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never

[p] Mat. 5. 30.
[3] Or, *cause thee to offend:* and so vs. 45, 47.

---

of them."———*It is better for him*:–Literally, and as the Rheims gives it, *it is good for him rather.* The word rendered *good* properly means *beautiful*, (καλόν). It is implied that, as there is a species of ethical *beauty* in what is honourable, and honest (or '*fair*'), so there is a species of semi-ethical *beauty*, or *attractiveness*, in what is profitable or advantageous. As many good things are not absolutely good, but only *good for certain other things;* so many beautiful things are not absolutely beautiful, but '*do beautifully*' *for the attainment of other things.*———*That a millstone were hanged about his neck*:–More literally, *if a millstone is hanged about his neck.* Very literally, *if a millstone is laid about his neck.* Note the present tenses,—*it* '*is*' *better for him, if a millstone* '*is*' *hanged about his neck.* It is primitive representation. We are taken, in imagination, into the presence of a certain dreadful scene. We see a millstone attached to a man's neck. The fastening, passing through the central perforation of the stone, is made secure. It is a sad sight. Yet, turning from another scene, we say, "This *is* better." It is better than that the same man should act the part of a seducer, and entrap a childlike follower of Jesus. Instead of the simple expression, *a millstone*, the critical editors, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, read *a great millstone*, literally, *a donkey-millstone*, that is, such a millstone as it required a donkey to work. (See on Matt. xviii, 6.) This reading is supported by the best manuscripts, inclusive of ℵBCD, and by the Vulgate, Peshito-Syriac, Gothic (*asiluquairnus*, i.e., *a donkey-quern*), Armenian, and Æthiopic versions.———*And he were cast into the sea*:–There is no *he* in the original. Sharpe supplies *it* instead, understanding the reference to be to the millstone. Wakefield took the same view. With reason, apparently,—*if a great millstone is hanged about his neck, and thrown into the sea*, viz. with the man attached. Literally, *has been thrown.* The sensational scene is represented as by an eye-witness. He sees the great stone lifted up, with its helpless appendage, and thrown into the sea. It is a sad temporal end to which to come. But how much sadder would it be to incur, in the world to come, the doom deserved by the seducer!

Ver. 43. *And if thy hand offend thee*:–Or, *And if thy hand should insnare thee* (ἐὰν σκανδαλίσῃ σε, the reading of the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts). If thy hand should tingle, to its finger-tips, with a longing to do what is bad; and if thou can'st not repress it.———*Cut it off*:–Wycliffe's version is, *kitt it awey;* Tyndale's and Coverdale's, *cut him of.* Use unsparingly spiritual surgery. Don't tamper with the temptation.———*It is better for thee*:–Very literally, *it is good.* Gothic, *goth.*———*To enter into life crippled*:–Very literally, *to enter into the life*, that is, *into the life* emphatically so called, the life of heavenly glory. (See *v.* 47.) Every other state, comparatively speaking, is a state of lifelessness or death.———*Than having two hands*:–Literally, *the two hands*,—the full complement of hands, "both hands."———*To depart into the Gehenna*:–That is, *the Valley of Hinnom*,—the place of future punishment. It was a common

shall be quenched: 44 [q]where their worm dieth [q] Isai. 66. 24.

Jewish representation:—and a most graphic hieroglyph it was. The literal Gehenna was a valley to the south of Jerusalem, naturally "pleasant," as Milton describes it; but having become the scene of the worship of Molech, "the abomination of the children of Ammon" (1 Kings xi, 7), its associations became frightful. Human sacrifices had been offered. Innocent children were made to pass through the fire to the "grim idol." "According to the "Rabbins," says Dr. Porter, "the statue of Molech was of brass, with the body "of a man and the head of an ox. The interior was hollow and fitted up with "a large furnace, by which the whole statue was easily made red-hot. The "children to be sacrificed were then placed in its arms, while drums were "beaten to drown their cries." (*Syria*, p. 92.) These were horrible rites, and king Josiah, in consequence, caused the "pleasant" place, where they had been perpetrated, to be desecrated and "defiled." (2 Kings xxiii, 10, 13.) The locality became a place of sepulture (Jer. vii, 32); and to this day the surrounding rocks are pierced in all directions with ancient tombs. It would appear also that it had become in later times a place of refuse, where carcases and other abominations were thrown. The consequence was that "worms" would be there; and no doubt, occasionally also, as required, "fires" would be kindled to consume the noisome accumulations. Altogether, the uses, to which the place had been put, made it a graphic symbol for the refuse-place of the universe;—"black Gehenna," says Milton, "type of hell." (*Par. Lost*, i, 405.) "Having," says Dr. Barclay, "been the scene of such pollution, wickedness, and torment, it became a fit emblem of everlasting punishment." (*City of the Great King*, p. 90.———*Into the inextinguishable fire*:—The fires that were occasionally lit in the literal Gehenna or Tophet were necessarily only temporary. They died out for want of fuel. It was to be otherwise with the "fire" of the other and ulterior Tophet. The "fire" referred to is, of course, a mere symbol of the sum-total of certain dreadful realities, positive and privative, for which there are no adequate representations in human language.

VER. 44. *Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched*: There is some reason for supposing that these words, which are repeated in verse 46, have been added by a later hand out of verse 48, where they are unquestionably genuine. It is noticeable that at the conclusion of verse 47, the word *inextinguishable* is not found, and thus, when in verse 48 it is said *where the fire is not quenched*, there is no approach to what might be considered an idle repetition or redundancy. There seems, however, to be something like such repetition or redundancy in the relation of verse 44 to the conclusion of verse 43. Tischendorf has cancelled the verse altogether. So has Ewald in his German version. Meyer approves of the omission, and Klostermann. The verse is wanting in the Sinaitic, Vatican, and Parisian manuscripts, (ℵBC), as well as in LΔ; and in 1, and other cursives. It is wanting too in the Coptic version, and in Zohrab's Armenian version. It is, certainly, more probable that it would be deliberately added, than that it would be wilfully omitted; for there was no fastidiousness in early times in reference to the doctrine of everlasting punishment. There was rather,—in harmony with a peculiar development of society, that presented but a limited breadth of spiritual

not, and the fire is not quenched. 45 And if thy foot [4] offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter [4] See ver. 43.
halt into life, than having two feet to be cast into hell, into
the fire that never shall be quenched: 46 where their worm
dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. 47 And if thine
[r] eye [5] offend thee, pluck it out: it is better for thee [r] Mat. 5. 29.
to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, [5] See ver. 43.
than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire: 48 where

---

surface for the operation of higher and diviner motives,—a tendency to give peculiar emphasis to the dreadful effects, within the sphere of sensibility, of persisted-in wickedness. Some very early transcriber, therefore, having his eye upon effective ecclesiastical lection, might introduce the words on a principle of solemn liturgical refrain, and be sincerely persuaded, all the time, that he was doing no injury to the text, inasmuch as the words actually occur in verse 48. See on verse 48.

VER. 45. *And if thy foot insnare thee* :–Feeling, as it were, restless, and eager, until it get thee conveyed into some improper place. Our Saviour, of course, specifies *hand* and *foot* only for rhetorical purposes. It is a fine, bold, graphic way of bringing home to the imagination and the bosom the idea of what is near and dear to our natural feelings. He speaks in hieroglyphics. "We are to "understand," says Petter, "not the parts of the body so called, but anything "which is as near and dear to us in this world." "The meaning is not," says Richard Baxter, "that any man is in such a case, that he hath no better way "to avoid sin and hell; but if he had no better, he should choose this. Nor "doth it mean that maimed persons are maimed in heaven: but if it were so, it "were a less evil."———*Cut it off* :–The Rheims version is *brusque,—choppe it of.* ———*It is better for thee to enter into life lame, than having both feet to be cast into Gehenna* :–The manuscripts ℵBCLΔ, 1, and the Syriac-Peshito and Coptic versions, stop here. So does Zohrab's Armenian version. So do Tischendorf and Tregelles. The Received Text adds the words *into the inextinguishable fire.* See on verses 43, 44.

VER. 46. This verse is omitted by the same authorities which omit verse 44. In addition, the latter half is omitted in the Æthiopic version.

VER. 47. *And if thine eye insnare thee* :–"Lusting," as it were, to see in thine own possession what, of right, belongs to others; or, if it otherwise allure thee to what is forbidden, as when Eve felt that the fruit of the forbidden tree was "a desire to the eyes" (Gen. iii, 6).———*Pluck it out* :–Literally, *cast it out.* Tyndale has *plucke him oute.* Coverdale, *cast him from thee.*———*It is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of God* :–In glory, to wit. See *v.* 43.——— *With one eye*: Literally, *one-eyed* (μονόφθαλμον). Wycliffe strangely renders it, *goyil-yghed.* The Attic purists would have used a different word from that employed by the evangelist, (ἑτερόφθαλμον.—See Phrynichus, Thomas Magister, and Moeris).———*Than, having two eyes, to be cast into Gehenna* :–While it is said in verse 43, "*the* two hands," that is, *both hands*, and in verse 44, "*the* two feet," or *both feet*, the expression in this case is simply "two eyes." Thus there was no slavish attachment to one form or formula of representation.

VER. 48. *Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not extinguished* :–An

their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.

---

expression borrowed from the last verse of Isaiah, and probably in current use among the Jews of our Saviour's time, as applied to the state of future retribution. There is a commingled reference to two modes of destruction, vermicular putrefaction, and fire. When men's bodies are destroyed, it is generally either by the one agency, or by the other. Both are here combined for cumulative rhetorical effect. And the dread climax of the whole representation is found in the ceaselessness of the twofold operation. Theophylact explains the *worm* and the *fire* as metaphorical representations of the conscience and memory of the lost. The explanation is too narrow. But doubtless the representation is intended to be hieroglyphical. When Fritzsche says that no figure was intended (*dicuntur sine ullâ figurâ*), he either attributed arbitrarily to our Lord, or to the evangelist, an abject sensuousness of conception, or he failed to apprehend that sentences, as really as words, may be figurative. They are but words of greater length.—Note the difference in the two expressions, "*their* worm" and "*the* fire." The worm is regarded as *belonging* to the body. The fire is considered as something outside. The representations are both popular, but eminently graphic.

VER. 49. *For every one shall be salted with fire, and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt*:-Almost all expositors and critics speak of these expressions, and especially the former, as among the most difficult in the Bible. "The "passage," says Grimm, "is exceedingly difficult" (*perdifficilis locus*). "It is," says Jansen, "exceedingly obscure" (*perobscurus*). "It is," says Wolf, "exceedingly vexed." "It is," says Heumann, "exceedingly vexing." "There is perhaps," says Bloomfield, "no passage in the New Testament, "which has so defied all efforts to assign to it any certain interpretation." "It "is," says Ryle, "one of those knots, which are yet untied in the exposition of "Scripture." "It has put to the rack the ingenuity of many learned men," says Grotius. "It is," says Fritzsche, "one of those passages, in which, because "of their extraordinary obscurity, crosses seem to be fixed on which to torture "expositors." "It is certainly," says Spanheim, "among the passages that "are *hard to be understood*" (*Dubia*, iii, p. 451). Many separate treatises have been published on it, and very many long and elaborate notes, full of ingenuity and learning, have been written to throw light upon it. We do not despair however; and we feel persuaded that the true view will not be far removed from simplicity. Beza's celebrated manuscript, now in Cambridge (D), omits the first clause of the verse, *every one shall be salted with fire*, and that clause, accordingly, is wanting in Whiston's *Primitive New Testament*. It is wanting, too, in some copies of the Old-Latin version. The transcribers of these copies and of D had evidently been puzzled by the phrase. But if it had not been in Mark's autograph, we may rest assured that no annotator would ever have spontaneously introduced it. Some high manuscriptural authorities, again, omit the second clause of the verse, *and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt*. Both the Sinaitic and the Vatican Manuscript (ℵB) omit it; and LΔ; and 1, and a considerable number of other cursives. It is omitted too in certain manuscripts of the Coptic version, and in Zohrab's Armenian version. David Schulz suspected its genuineness (*glossam olet*); and Tischendorf has left it out

49 For every one shall be salted with fire, and

in his 8th edition of the Text. Unreasonably. It is the necessary stepping-stone to what comes after; and yet its connection with what goes before is not so obtrusively evident as to make it astonishing that some transcribers should have looked upon it as an apocryphal addition to the original text. The repetition, moreover, of the concluding verb (ἁλισθήσεται) might in one or two cases mislead the transcriber's eye. We must retain both clauses of the verse. We must also retain both in their integrity. The celebrated Joseph Scaliger,—a man of marvellous force of intellect,—was deeply interested in the passage. But he was confident that the first clause had got to be corrupted at a very early period in the dissemination of the Gospel. He was also confident that he had discovered the original reading. The connective *for*, he assumed, should be cashiered, and then the whole verse should be read thus,—"*Every burning* (πᾶσα πυρία *i.e.* every offering made by fire) *shall be salted, and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt.*" He mentioned this conjectural emendation of the phraseology to Grotius. He contended for it strongly once and again in his letters still extant. (See *Wolf.*) And in Rouiere's edition of the Greek Testament, "*with Joseph Scaliger's Notes on some of the more difficult passages*" (1619), the emendation is repeated. Petter accepts it; and Louis Cappel thought it "exceedingly probable." But Grotius did right to reject it: as did Gataker (*Adversaria*, xliii, Op. p. 889); and also Spanheim (*Dubia*, iii, p. 452). Also Dr. Adam Clarke, who says, "This, I fear, is taking the text *by storm.*" In fact Scaliger *invented* a sacrificial word for the occasion, and was fascinated by the ingenuity of his invention. The phraseology needs no tinkering. The introductory *For* is genuine, and is, of itself, fatal to Scaliger's conjecture. We are by no means, however, shut up to the conclusion of Maldanato, Jansen, Meyer, and many others, that the reference of the reason-rendering conjunction is simply to what is said at the conclusion of the preceding verse, *and the fire shall not be quenched.* There is no occasion whatever for insisting on such a short and narrow bridge of transit. It is far more probable that the reference is to the great pervading idea of verses 43—48, *that it is indispensable for all such, as would escape the retribution of inextinguishable fire, to be unsparing in their treatment of the insnaring members of their own persons.* Let them not hesitate for a moment to mortify, cut off, and cauterize, these rebellious members. Such is the Lord's graphic way of representing the sacrifices which his disciples would require to make for conscience' sake. These sacrifices, says he, must be made, *for*———*Every one shall be salted with fire*:—*Every one*, viz. of those who are referred to in the preceding context. And these are not, as has been too often assumed,—as by Maldonato, Jansen, Lightfoot, Grotius, Elsner, Wesley, Rosenmüller, Alexander, Patrizi,—the *unbelieving;* but, on the contrary, *the believing.* So Erasmus, Luther (*Gloss*), Flacius (*Clavis*, ii, 601), Calvin, Spanheim, Gataker, Wetstein, Heumann, Richard Watson, Glöckler, Dav. Brown. The Saviour is addressing *his disciples*, and counselling them in reference to the temptations, to which they were sure to be subjected in consequence of their relationship, "in the flesh," to the manifold corruptions of "the present evil age." Yield not to these temptations, says he. On the contrary, cut off unsparingly the occasions of them, as far as in you lies, and

[s]every sacrifice shall be salted with salt.

[s] Lev. 2. 13. Ezek. 43. 24.

thus escape the doom of those who allow themselves to be insnared,—*for every one (of my disciples)*———*Shall be salted with fire*:-What does this mean? It means, says Theophylact, *shall be tried by fire*,—a mere guess of an interpretation. And yet it is reproduced by Dionysius à Ryckel. It also found its way into some unimportant cursive manuscripts. Grotius translates the phrase, *shall be consumed with fire*. This translation is accepted by Hammond, Le Clerc, Dr. Samuel Clarke, Wells, Mace, and Storr (*Opuscula*, ii, 212), on the ground that the Hebrew word, that means *to be salted*, also means *to be consumed*, or *to vanish away* (Isai li, 6). But it is enough to say that the Greek word has no such meaning. And it would be hard to believe that the Hebrew usage could so dominate Greek Palestinian usage, as to ascribe to the same word, in the same verse, two meanings so contrary as *consumed* and *salted;* and, more especially, as the best Hebrew philologers maintain that the Hebrew word is indeed not one word, but two, accidentally coincident in sound, but belonging to totally different roots. We must adhere, then, to the translation, *shall be salted with fire*. But what can be made of it? Lightfoot, supposing that the reference is to *the unbelieving*, explains thus, "shall be seasoned with fire itself, so as "to become unconsumable, and shall endure for ever to be tormented, as "salt preserves from corruption." Alexander Morus gives the same interpretation (*Notae*, in loc.), and Michaelis (*Anmerkungen*, in loc.), and Patrizi too. But it certainly involves a violent and unnatural wrench of conception. For while it is conceivable that, by the application of something incombustible, a substance might be preserved from the consuming influence of fire, it is really inconceivable that any substance should be rendered "unconsumable" by the application to it of the very element that consumes. Elsner and others,—also assuming a reference to the doom of unbelievers,—suppose that the imagery of the expression is borrowed from the catastrophe of Sodom and Gomorrha and the other "cities of the plain,"—*for every one shall be immersed in that abyss of fire and salt*. Eccentric; a shift. Schöttgen, Macknight, and Baumgarten-Crusius render the expression *shall be salted 'for' the fire*. Eccentric too,—though in another line of things; a subterfuge. But what then? How can there be "salting *with* fire?" We must, in the first place, distinguish "letter" from "spirit" in the two terms *salted* and *fire*. Our Saviour is not, in either of the terms, referring to the literal realities. It is *salting* metaphorically viewed, and *fire* metaphorically viewed, of which he speaks: and hence the possibility of perfect congruity in the apparently incongruous idea of "salting *with* fire." Among the various uses of salt, two are popularly outstanding,—*seasoning*, and *preserving from corruption*. In the passage before us there is no reference to *seasoning*, although Principal Campbell actually translates the word *shall be seasoned*. The reference is exclusively to *preservation from corruption*. In hot countries in particular, killed meat hastens to a tainted condition, and could not be preserved from spoiling, either by cooks or priests, for any appreciable length of time, *were it not for salting*. It is on this antiseptic property of salt that the Saviour's representation is founded. *Every one of his disciples shall be preserved from corruption by fire*. The *fire* referred to, however, is not *penal*, like the inextinguishable fire of Gehenna. It

is intentionally *purificatory*. And yet when we take the preceding context into account, we may rest assured that its purificatory efficacy is referred to, *not merely because it is purificatory* (comp. Matt. iii, 11), but also because, in its purificatory action, *it is painful, though not penal*. It scorches, and pierces to the quick. It is such *fire* as is in certain "*fiery* trials," willingly endured for righteousness' sake, (1 Peter iv, 12.) It is *fire* that "eats the flesh" (James v, 3), and is "sent into the bones," (Lament. i, 13). It is its cauterizing smart and energy that are felt, when a hand, or foot, or eye, is parted with for the sake of purity. What, then, is this *fire?* It is not simply and generically, as Heumann supposed, the purifying influence of the Holy Spirit,—an influence purifying the soul as fire purifies silver. Neither is it simply, as Luther and Calov supposed, the purifying power of the Gospel. Still less is it, as others have supposed, such as Baxter, Wolf, Hofmeister, Kuinöl, the painfully purifying influence of afflictions in general, or of persecutions in particular for the Gospel's sake. It is another phase of purifying influence. It is,—as Cardinal Cajetan, Beza, Spanheim, and Wetstein saw,—*the unsparing spirit of self-sacrifice*. It is the *spirit* to which our Saviour refers in verses 43—48,—*the spirit that parts, for righteousness' sake, with a hand, a foot, an eye*. But instead of representing it here, once more, as manifesting itself in acts of amputation or excision, he takes occasion, from the incidental reference to *the fire of Gehenna*, to depict it, in striking and vivid antithesis, as an alternative fire (*opponit ignem igni, presentem futuro*,—Spanheim, p. 454), which indeed scorches the sensibility to agony, but which in the end consumes only what is bad, and leaves the soul freed from those moral combustibles on which the penal fire of Gehenna could feed. Every disciple of Christ is thus *salted with fire*. He is *preserved from corruption, and consequent everlasting destruction, by unsparing self-sacrifice.*———*And*:–Le Clerc, and Beausobre-et-Lenfant, in their respective French versions, as also Schöttgen and du Veil, translate this conjunction, *even as*. Heumann and others defend the rendering. But it not only does violence to the conjunction, it throws the whole clause, which it introduces, into the position of a mere foil, to give emphasis to the idea of the preceding clause. There is no need for thus "vexing" the word. It has its ordinary signification, and introduces a statement which it is of importance for us to add to the preceding. Glöckler translates it *also.*———*Every sacrifice shall be salted with salt*:–The Saviour is alluding to what is said in Lev. ii, 13, "*and every oblation of thy meat-offering shalt thou season with salt; neither shalt thou suffer the salt of the covenant of thy God to be lacking from thy meat-offering. With all thine offerings thou shalt offer salt.*" At the commencement of this verse there is reference to such offerings as were derived from the *flora* of the earth. "Meat-offerings," in our version, mean *vegetable* or *farinaceous offerings*. At the conclusion of the verse the reference is extended to all offerings,—inclusive therefore of such as were derived from the *fauna* of the earth—animal offerings. See Ezek. xliii, 23, 24. The expression *seasoned with salt* is admirably adapted to "meat-offerings," which did not require salting to preserve them from corrupting. But the Hebrew phrase, so rendered, is simply, like the Greek phrase in the passage before us, *salted with salt*. All kinds of offerings *were to be salted with salt*, just as, generally speaking, all kinds of food, used by the people, *were salted with salt*, in order to insure that they should be at once wholesome and pleasant. Our Saviour, in using the word *sacrifice*

50 Salt *is* good: but if the salt have [t] lost his [t] Mat. 5. 13. Luke 14. 34.

(θυσία), instead of the expression *oblation of meat-offering*, employed a term which naturally suggests an animal-offering; and hence the *salting with salt*, in so far as he gives it emphasis, recalls the antiseptic virtue of salt, as distinguished from its seasoning influence, and thus brings into view not merely, in a generic way, what was required to make food palatable, but, in a specific way, what was needed to preserve animal-food from taint and loathsomeness. Our Lord transfers to New Testament times, and exalts into spiritual and world-wide maxims, the rudimentary principles of the Dispensation of Shadows. And thus the *salt* of the Old Testament priest is reproduced in the *spirit* of the New Testament worshipper,—that *spirit* which is a moral antiseptic, because instinct with the influence of the Holy Spirit of God. The idea of our Saviour amounts to this. -*Every true self-sacrifice, presented to God, is presented in a state of (comparative) purity, sweetness, and consequent acceptableness, in virtue of the purity-imparting spirit of the sacrificer.* God's ancient dispensation as a whole, and every particular ordinance in it as an integrant part, was *a covenant of purity*,—the purity in particular of reciprocal faithfulness. It was "a covenant of salt." (Lev. ii, 13; Numb. xviii, 19.) God and man, as it were, met together in amity, as under one roof, and pledged themselves to one another in rites of a sublime hospitality. This "covenant of salt" runs on into New Testament times; and man's part in it is fulfilled when he remembers never to present to the Infinite Guest, who condescends to enter his heart (Jo. xiv, 23), any other sacrifice than what is *salted with salt*.

VER. 50. *Salt is good*: Such is the general conviction of men; and yet there was extensively advertised a few years ago an English Publication, in which it was contended that almost all the ills, to which flesh is heir, are attributable to the use of salt! *Good*, literally *beautiful*. Spanheim explains the word as meaning *useful*. But *good* is better,—*good* for most important purposes, especially *seasoning* and *preserving*. Some have supposed that the *salt* here spoken of is to be viewed as a metaphorical impersonation, just as when it is said, in Matt. v, 13, *ye are the 'salt' of the earth*. So Petter, for instance, who says that the term here "signifies *the ministers of the word*,—yet not "simply considered in regard to their persons, but in regard of their ministerial "calling and office." He would thus interpret the expression, "*salt is good*," as meaning—"the true and faithful ministers of the Gospel, lawfully called to "their office, are necessary, profitable, and useful in the church of God, in "regard of their persons and ministry." This interpretation, however, is harsh, artificial, and grotesque. Our Saviour evidently uses the term in the same acceptation as in the preceding verse. What he says, indeed, is true of literal salt. But it is, in a higher plane of reference, equally true of the metaphorical salt of *a holy spirit*—a spirit instinct with *the Spirit of God*. Such salt is emphatically *good*. It is *good as a means*. It is the best possible human means for the highest possible human ends.———*But if the salt should become saltless*: -The Saviour speaks popularly; and his idea would be readily caught in Palestine. Maundrell mentions that in *The Valley of Salt, which is about four hours from Aleppo*, "there is a kind of dry crust of "salt, which sounds, when the horses go upon it, like frozen snow when it is

saltness, wherewith will ye season it? [u] Have salt in yourselves, and [v] have peace one with another.

[u] Col. 4. 6.

[v] Rom. 14. 19. 2 Cor. 13. 11. Heb. 12. 14.

"walked upon." He adds, "Along on one side of the Valley, viz. that "toward Gibul, there is a small precipice about two men's lengths, occasioned "by the continual taking away the salt; and in this you may see how the "veins of it lie. I broke a piece of it, of which the part that was exposed to "the rain, sun, and air, though it had the sparks and particles of salt, yet it "had perfectly *lost its savour*, (as in St. Matthew, Chapter v). The inner "part, which was connected with the rock, retained its savour, as I found by "proof." (*Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem*, pp. 161, 162, ed. 1749.) Whatever may be the case with literal salt, the Saviour is referring to spiritual salt, which undoubtedly, in so far as it consists of a phase of character, may be metamorphosed into its negative or contradictory. Such metamorphic changes of character are possible in two directions. They may be realized upwardly, in bad beings becoming good, or downwardly, in good beings becoming bad. Hatred may be transformed into love, or love into hatred. In either case there is "conversion" from contrary to contrary.——*Wherewith will ye season it?* Or, '*in what*' *will ye season it?* '*in what*' will ye steep it, as it were, so as to restore its sapidity? If it should be replied, *in other salt*, then it suffices to remark that the Saviour was representing to himself a case which did not admit of such an alternative. With him all salt is a means to an end. It is the means of salting; but, of course, not of salting saltless salt. For, if animal food, for instance, should require to be preserved from wasting, or other food to be seasoned, why take the circuitous way of first salting insipid or saltless salt, and then applying this for preserving or seasoning? No good end could be subserved by such a circuit, and hence the ridiculous process itself was never contemplated by our Lord, or by any other one. Our Lord simply intimates, by a striking mode of thought, that as nothing in the natural world would be more useless than saltless salt, so nothing in the spiritual world would be more hopelessly useless than Christianity which is no longer Christian, or holiness which is no longer holy, or evangelicism that has ceased to be evangelical, or religiousness that has degenerated into irreligion. What if a man have "a name to live," while he is "dead"? What if a church have such a name? Could they be Blessings in the world? It is impossible. It is in vain to try, by any process of galvanism, to restore life to a putrid or putrescent mass. Omnipotence alone could meet such an emergency. But, in all ordinary cases, so far as spiritual life is concerned, it is a moral result which the Omnipotent One desires; and it is therefore moral means which he employs.——*Have salt in yourselves*:—A practical inference, says Cardinal Cajetan, from "the Parable of Salt." Note the "*in*." The true spirit of holiness or good-doing is not a thing that can be put on. It is within. It may come out indeed. It must come out. But it must come out from within,—seasoning at once works and words (Col. iv, 6), and rendering our sacrifices pure and acceptable (*v.* 49).——*And have peace "one with another"*:—A corresponding expression is employed 1 Thess. v, 13, *Be at peace "among yourselves."* Tyndale combines, to a certain extent, the two phrases, in his translation of the passage before us, *Have peace amonge youre*

## CHAPTER X.

*Jesus travels toward Judæa by the eastern side of Jordan,* 1. *On his way various memorable incidents occur.* (1.) *Pharisees question him on the subject of divorce,* 2—12. (2.) *Little children are brought to him that he might bless them,* 13—16. (3.) *A young rich man asks him what he should do to inherit everlasting life,* 17—27. (4.) *Peter says to him that his fellow-disciples and himself, unlike the rich young man, had left all to follow him,* 28—31. (5.) *He tells his disciples once more of the treatment which he was about to receive in Jerusalem,* 32—34. (6.) *James and John, the sons of Zebedee, ask to be seated, the one at his right hand, and the other at his left, in his glory,* 35—40. (7.) *The other disciples were incensed at James and John; and Jesus takes occasion to explain who should be greatest in his kingdom,* 41—45. (8.) *He heals a blind man at Jericho,* 46—52.

[a] AND he arose from thence, and cometh into the [a] Mat. 19. 1. John 10. 40.

*selves one with another.* The Saviour, in thus winding up his conversation, reverts to the subject with which he had started. His disciples had disputed *who should be greatest* (*v.* 34). The dispute had threatened to break up the circle into cliques of partizanship. Harmony was endangered; and if harmony were lost, their moral influence in the world would be crippled. It was needful that they should co-operate. It was needful therefore that they should "be at peace with one another." But there would be security for their unity, only if they had salt—the spirit of purity—"in themselves." It is difficult to restrain the conviction to which Bishop Hammond gives expression, that our Lord had a touch of reference, in the injunction—*and be at peace with one another*, "to that other quality of salt, as it is a sign of union." If it be true that God and man have entered into "a covenant of salt," then surely his children should pledge themselves to each other in a corresponding covenant. Since they sit at one table, and are partakers of the common salt, and have it "in" them, they should be inviolably true to one another.

## CHAPTER X.

Verses 1—12 of this chapter constitute a paragraph corresponding to Matt. xix, 1—9.

Ver. 1. *And he arose from thence and cometh*:—A more awkward expression than there was any occasion for in translation. In the original the phrase *from thence*, or *thence*, or *from there* (ἐκεῖθεν), stands before the whole of the clause, so that its incidence reaches to *cometh*,—*And thence when he had risen up he cometh*, that is, *And he rose up and departed*. It is a primitive mode of

coasts of Judæa by the farther side of Jordan: and the people resort unto him again; and, as he was wont, he taught them again.

2 And the [b]Pharisees came to him, and asked [b] Mat. 19. 3.

---

representation, exemplifying a kind of "pre-raphaelite" particularity of detail. We not only see the Saviour setting out on his journey,—we see him *rising up* that he might set out. The representation is analogous in principle to the expression, "and *he opened his mouth* and taught." (Matt. v, 2; comp. Mark vii, 24.) The point of departure was Capernaum, on the west side of the sea of Tiberias. (Chap. ix, 33.)———*Into the coasts of Judæa*:-*Coasts* or confines. (See chap. vii, 24.) The evangelist leads our thoughts, meanwhile, not to the terminus of our Lord's journey, in the heart of Judæa, but to the boundary-line at which he entered the district. It was apparently the last southward journey of our Lord, though not the first. Modern critics, indeed, of the sceptical school, insist that no other journey into Judæa was known either to Mark, or to the two other synoptic evangelists. But both Matthew and Luke represent our Lord as saying,—"O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, *how often* would I have gathered thy children together,—and ye would not." (Matt. xxiii, 37: Luke xiii, 34.) It was, moreover, most improbable that our Saviour and his disciples would refrain from going up to the great festivals. And there is not, in Mark's narrative here, the slightest indication that he regarded our Lord as entering upon a novel or unprecedented career.———*By the farther side of Jordan*:-The eastern side. The reading of the Sinaitic, Vatican, and Parisian manuscripts (ℵBC) is, *and on the farther side of the Jordan*, that is, *and indeed on the farther side of the Jordan*. Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles, have accepted this reading. Our Saviour did not pass through Samaria. Or, if he did (Luke xvii, 11), he crossed over thence into Peræa before he entered the border-lands of Judæa.———*And the people went unto him again*: In the original the reference is not to any "people" that may have been formerly spoken of. The term employed is indeterminate, *crowds* (ὄχλοι),—*And crowds again gather toward him.*———*And, as he was wont, he taught them again*:-Or, *and again he taught them, as he was wont*. It is not meant *that he taught the same people again*. The idea is that he resumed his former plan of operation, no longer shunning crowds because in quest of seclusion with his disciples. He chose, on the contrary, favourable amphitheatres of assembly, along the line of his route, and taught the congregated masses, as had been his wont.

Ver. 2. *And*:-At a certain unspecified stage in his progress.———*The Pharisees*:-Note the article. It is in the Received Text, and it has been readmitted by Tischendorf into the 8th edition of his critical text. It is found in the Sinaitic and Ephraemi manuscripts (ℵC), as also in NVX. But it is omitted by Griesbach, Scholz, Lachmann, Tregelles, Alford. It is wanting in the great body of the uncial manuscripts, inclusive of the Alexandrine and Vatican (AB). It is a matter of no moment whether it be admitted or rejected. If admitted, it marks the party or sect to which the individuals referred to belonged. If it be omitted, then the evangelist leaves it indeterminate whether the individuals introduced to our notice should be regarded as representing the views of the entire Pharisaic body.———*Came to him, and asked him*:-

him, Is it lawful for a man to put away *his* wife? tempting him. 3 And he answered and said unto them, What did Moses command you? 4 And they said, [c]Moses

[c] Deut. 24. 1. Mat. 5. 31.

They came forward from the rest of the people, *approached and questioned him.*———*Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife*:–Or more literally, in the indirect form, *if it is lawful for a man to put away his wife*, or, as Tyndale gives it, *whether it were lawfull for a man to put awaye his wyfe*. So too Coverdale and Luther. The nature of the case makes it evident that the meaning of the indirect query is,—Whether it is lawful for a man to put away his wife *at his pleasure* as it were, or, as it is expressed in Matthew xix, 3, *for every cause*. It is altogether gratuitous in Saunier to say that the representation of Matthew is "obviously the more correct" (*Quellen*, p. 120). It is equally gratuitous in F. C. Baur to maintain that Mark "intentionally" made a variation from the representation of Matthew (*Marcusevangelium*, p. 81). There is no discrepancy to be accounted for, as is obvious when we look at the subject from the standpoint of common-sense, and, as will be specially obvious, when we take into account that it is, as a general rule, only certain salient points of our Lord's conversations, discussions, and remarks, that are recorded. We may reasonably assume that on the present occasion there would be details of colloquy, of which neither the one evangelist nor the other makes mention. In the course of these details, the varied recorded forms of remarks, or their equivalents, and no doubt many others from which other evangelists might have selected, would occur.———*Tempting him*:–The English word *tempting* has, in its modern use, a much stronger twist in the direction of what is evil, than it had in our older literature, and in the passage before us. And yet it was intended by our translators to have here a bend in that evil direction. Rightly so, apparently. The word originally means *trying*, or *attempting* as it were. Tyndale translates it here, *to prove him*. Principal Campbell, *to try him*. So Wakefield, Newcome, Edgar Taylor. Rilliet has, *wishing thus to put him to the test (à l'épreuve)*. Norton, following in the wake of Mace, goes much farther in the direction of the evil meaning, *with a design to insnare him*. There had been among the Jewish Rabbis great discussions on the subject of divorce, and serious dissension. The Hillelites, the followers of Hillel, maintained that divorce might be lawfully effected at the pleasure or caprice of the husband; while the Shammaites, the followers of Shammai, contended that "putting away" was lawful only on condition of the occurrence of unchastity. (See Michaelis's *Mosaisches Recht*, §. 120.) Our Lord's questioners were probably confident in their own particular notion on the subject, and imagined that they would be able to get him to say something, which they could make use of to "corner him up," or to diminish his influence with the people. (See *Commentary on Matthew* xix, 1—12.

VER. 3. *But he answered and said unto them, What did Moses command you?* Or, as Tyndale has it, *What dyd Moses byd you do?* He wished them to have in view their own political statute on the subject. It had been much abused in the controversies that had been waged.

VER. 4. *And they said, Moses permitted to write a bill of divorcement and to put away*:–See Deut. xxiv, 1. Instead of *a bill of divorcement* Wycliffe has *a*

suffered to write a bill of divorcement, and to put *her* away. 5 And Jesus answered and said unto them, For the [d]hardness of your heart he wrote you this precept. [d] Deut. 31. 27. Psa. 78. 8.

*libel of forsakinge*, and Tyndale *a testimoniall of devorsement*. The word thus rendered *bill*, *libel*, *testimonial*, properly means *a little book* (βιβλίον), that is, *a formal writing*, or *document*. *Libel*, in its original signification (*libellus*), exactly corresponds to the evangelist's term; and, if *bill* be *libel* cut down, it too will be an exact rendering. Our Lord's questioners used the word *permitted*, or *suffered*. It was legitimate. And yet it brought into view only one aspect of the case, and that not the most important, when the question was considered not so much politically, as morally. See next verse.

Ver. 5. *And Jesus answered and said to them*:–Or, as it stands more briefly in the manuscripts ℵBCLΔ, and the Coptic version, as also in Tregelles's and Tischendorf's texts, *But Jesus said to them.———For the hardness of your heart he wrote you this precept*:–It was a *precept*, therefore, or *injunction*, as really as a *permission*. It was a statute that was intended to throw some restraints upon summary dismissal. Such dismissal was constituted illegal. Divorce, henceforth, could not be effected until a regular instrument or document was legally drawn up, and handed over to the unfortunate wife. "In "this way," says Michaelis, "a marriage could never be dissolved in the first "heat of passion; and the husband might perhaps change his mind, or, the "person employed to write the bill of divorce –probably a priest or Levite— "might perhaps be a man of principle, who would speak to the husband "before he set about the writing. This delay, affording time for reflection, "could not fail to put a stop to many divorces resolved on under the influence "of passion." (*Mosaisches Recht*, §. 119. 3.) The legislation of Moses on the subject was thus benevolent in its aim. It had to deal, we may presume, with an exceedingly lax and latidudinarian use-and-wont, that would press crushingly upon the weaker sex. It did not indeed, and could not, accomplish all that is morally desirable. What legislator can? What legislation can, if it be intended to meet the actual requirements of exceedingly imperfect and perverted states of society? The political institutions of the Jews, though divinely devised, could scarcely even initiate an approximation to an ideal state of society. That goal was contemplated indeed; but it was far off in the distance. And meanwhile the uncultured people required as much political restraint and constraint, and just as much, as was politically practicable. The marriage statute, we need not doubt, would have been far more stringent in its restraints, had it not been for the people's moral unpreparedness, *their hardness-of-heart*. They were far from being in an ideal state of heart. They were as yet, comparatively speaking, coarse in their views, and insensitive in their feelings,—irresponsive to highly refined principles of delicacy and purity. Hence there was no alternative between giving them imperfect political institutions, up to the level of which they could be lifted, and thence prepared for farther ascent, or giving them absolutely perfect institutions, which could not have been transferred into their practice even for a single day. Absolutely perfect political institutions would be adapted only to an absolutely perfect people, or a people who were on the eve of emerging into absolute moral perfec-

6 But from the beginning of the creation [e]God made them male and female. 7 [f]For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife; 8 and they twain shall be [g]one flesh:

e Gen. 1. 27. Gen. 5. 2.
f Gen. 2. 24.
g 1 Cor. 6. 16. Eph. 5. 31.

tion. The expression '*for*' (πρός) *the hardness of your heart*, does not so much mean *because of*, as *in reference to,—in respect to,*—that is, *to meet the case of,—the hardness of your heart.* Politics, while ever aspiring toward a moral ideal, must yet be proportional, in the ratio of their development, to the actual moral condition of the people.

VER. 6. *But from the beginning of the creation*:—Very literally, *from creation's beginning.* The word *creation* properly means *the act of creating;* but here it denotes *the object in which the act terminated, the thing created, the world.* The original word (κτίσις) has no inherent reference to *absolute creation*, or *production out of nothing.* Neither was it intended that the word *beginning* should be pressed to a nicety. Men were not in existence at the absolute beginning. The idea is substantially this,—*From the time when men were first divinely introduced upon the scene of creation.* Petter explains it, "from the time when God did first create mankind."———*God made them male and female*:—It is not, *God made them*, but *he made them*, in the manuscripts ℵBCLΔ; and such is the reading of Tischendorf and Tregelles. It is no doubt the correct reading. The Saviour was simply quoting the words of Gen. i, 27, as they stand in the Septuagint; and it would have been well if our translators had suggested the fact of verbal quotation, by preserving the very collocation of the original phraseology,—"*male and female made he them.*" *Male and female*, that is, *a male and a female.* The reference is to two, and two only. The one was the counterpart of the other. Each was fitted to be the other's complement, both physically and morally. It is one of the marvels of Providence, and a striking demonstration of the continuous working of the Creator, that, notwithstanding the multitudinous perturbations of things that are the result of sin, the proportional monogamistic numbers of the sexes are still maintained, as in a balance, all the world over.

VER. 7. *For this cause*:—The Saviour continues to quote, but from another part of the early record, viz. Gen. ii, 24. The *cause*, or *condition of things*, referred to, is *the counterpart and complementive relationship of the two sexes.*———*Shall a man leave his father and mother*:—Because in marriage a higher relationship supervenes, which dominates the antecedent filial relationship. A new domestic centre is to be established.———*And cleave to his wife*:—These words are wanting in the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts (ℵB), and also in the Gothic version. Tischendorf has omitted them in his 8th edition, without sufficient warrant. *Cleave* is Wycliffe's word. It is Coverdale's too, and adopted in both the Geneva and the Rheims. It is an admirable translation, much better than either Purvey's *draw*, or Tyndale's *bide*,—"*and bide by his wife.*" It is rendered *join himself* in Acts v, 36, and *be joined* in Eph. v, 31. The original term (προσκολληθήσεται) denotes the closest possible attachment and adherence. Very literally rendered, it means, as Petter remarks, *shall be glued.*

VER. 8. *And they twain*:—An archaism for *the two* (οἱ δύο). The expression

so then they are no more twain, but one flesh. 9 What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.

---

does not occur in the Hebrew passage from which our Lord quotes. He freely supplies it, as embodying the manifest meaning of the original.———*Shall be one flesh*:–Literally, *shall be into one flesh*, that is, shall be so intimately united, that, in their earthly or bodily relationships, they shall constitute as it were a unit of being.———*So that they are no longer two, but one flesh*:–What has preceded is quotation from Gen. ii, 24. This is the Saviour's own inference from the language quoted. Husband and wife, though in a sense *two*, are yet, if they fulfil the divine ideal, *no longer two*. They are but halves of a whole,—"one flesh." Were it not for the intervenience of sin, the most delightful union conceivable would be realized in their experience.

Ver. 9. *What therefore God joined together*:–Namely, in his institute of marriage. Note (1) the word *what*. It is in the singular number,—*what thing* (ὅ). The Saviour's mind had gone forward, in conception, beyond the stage of duality into the stage of unity. Note (2) the phrase *joined together*, or *coupled* as Tyndale has it. Coverdale has *coupled together*. So the Geneva. The word strictly means *yoked together*. Husband and wife are under a common yoke; and under this yoke, "lined with love," they are to work together, as "true yokefellows." Note (3) that it is "God" who yokes them together in the institute of marriage. Marriage is his institute, his idea. And he acts,—not directly indeed,—but indirectly and institutionally,—when man and woman take each other for husband and wife. But man and woman act too. They act directly, in subordination to the divine institution. They choose each other. If they choose thoughtlessly, recklessly, capriciously, or selfishly, what wonder that human perturbations should be introduced into the divine institution? ———*Let not man put asunder*:–Or, as Tyndale has it, *Let no man separate*. What? Not even when there are insurmountable incompatibilities? There should be no such incompatibilities. Not one,—or at least scarcely one,—of the multitudinous perturbations, which so often perplex the marriage-relation, would ever have scope for operation, if the divine will regarding a "pre-established harmony" were duly regarded. *God's institute has never got justice done it in the world.* It is impossible to make happy in wedlock those who make no moral provision for united happiness in the interblendings of every-day life. And yet, instead of the evil of unhappiness being lessened, by the degradation of the divine ideal, over the length and breadth of society, and the consequent relaxation of the matrimonial tie, it would be but intensified into greater and more intricate perplexities. Legislative relief may, in certain circumstances, be politically necessary, *because of the hardness of men's hearts.* But it is always an evil. And when legislation has to descend, step by step, from the divine ideal of things, and even from the highest human ideal, instead of maintaining a gradual progression of ascent toward its own normal pinnacle of development, it is a symptom of social decay. Legislation should move in another direction, and initiate and foster measures, that may tend to fit the rising youth for understanding, and working out, the laws of physical, aesthetical, and moral, correspondencies and harmony.

10 And in the house his disciples asked him again of the same *matter*. 11 And he saith unto them, [h]Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, [h] Mat. 5. 32. Rom. 7. 3. 1 Cor. 7. 10.

VER. 10. *And in the house*:—Namely where they were lodging. In the very ancient manuscripts ℵBD, as well as LΔ, the expression is not, *in the house*, but *into the house*. Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, have admitted this more difficult reading into their texts. Rightly, no doubt. It is an abrupt and irregular phrase: but its meaning is obvious enough. The evangelist's mind was thinking of our Lord and his disciples, *as they entered 'into' the house*. ——*His disciples*:—Or, as the Sinaitic, Vatican, and Ephraemi manuscripts have it, *the disciples*.———*Questioned him again*:—As the Pharisees had done before.———*Concerning the same (matter)*:—Or, as the reading is in a large proportion of the best manuscripts, *concerning this (thing)*. This demonstrative reading is accepted by all the modern critical editors.

VER. 11. *And he says to them, If any one should put away his wife*:—The exception, specified in Matthew xix, 9, *except for conjugal unfaithfulness*, is of course to be understood. It had been specified in our Lord's remarks to the Pharisees outside. And it was really self-evident.———*And should marry another*:—Roman Catholic theologians contend that to marry another is unlawful, so long as the first wife, however unfaithful, remains alive. (See Denzinger's *Enchiridion*, §§. 597, 853, 878.) They allege that the exceptive clause, *except for conjugal unfaithfulness*, as occurring in Matt. xix, 9, has reference only to the contingency of *putting away the unfaithful wife (videlicet, quoad thorum)*, and does not extend to the second contingency of *marrying another*. The indissoluble union of Christ and the Church is, as they hold, the type and archetype of the union of husband and wife, under the New Testament Dispensation;—and the union therefore must remain indissoluble "till death do part them." (Denzinger's *Enchirid.* §. 597.) Luther and Calvin, however, and Protestants in general, hold that adultery is in fact,—at heart and in principle,—the rupture of wedlock, and that it therefore affords a perfectly legitimate ground on which the injured party may sue out a complete divorce, *(non solum quoad thorum, sed etiam quoad vinculum)*. They think, hence, that the exceptive clause in Matt. xix, 9 is not meant to be attached with lawyer-like exclusiveness to the contingency, with which it happens to be formally connected, and detached from the second contingency; just as they think that, in the passage before us, the exception is not intended to be ignored, although it is not formally introduced. This is, no doubt, the right view of the case; and, among Roman Catholic writers, both Erasmus and Cardinal Cajetan were of the same mind. But still, it should ever be borne in mind that the existence of "sin" has introduced all but inextricable confusion into the whole subject.———*Committeth adultery against her*:—Though the husband has put away his wife in fact, she is still his wife. He has merely put her *locally out of the way*. The expression *against her*, is literally *upon her* (ἐπ' αὐτήν), and is so rendered in the Vulgate version. Hence some expositors suppose that the reference is not to the wife who has been put away, but to the woman who has been superinduced into her place. This is the view of Theophylact, and Euthymius Zigabenus (δηλαδὴ τὴν ἐπείσακτον), as also of Elsner,

committeth adultery against her. 12 And if a woman shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery.

---

Ewald, Bleek, Lange. It is more likely, however, that the view entertained by the great majority of expositors is correct,—the view that is embodied in our Authorized Translation. The man commits adultery *in relation to his wife, in opposition to her rights and interests.* His adultery comes *upon her*, and is *against her.* The preposition is frequently rendered *against.* See Matt. x, 21, xii, 26; xxiv, 7; xxvi, 55; &c. Erasmus interprets the expression, *to her injury.*

Ver. 12. *And if a woman*:—Such is the reading of the Received Text, and also of Lachmann. Some exceedingly ancient and important manuscripts, however, instead of *a woman* (γυνή) read *she* (αὐτή). Such is the reading of ℵBCLΔ. It is also the reading of the Coptic and Æthiopic versions, and has been introduced into the texts of Tregelles, Tischendorf (8th ed.), Alford. It is no doubt the original reading. The other, and the other only, can be accounted for on the principle, so often acted on by transcribers, that it is innocent to amend or improve a mere matter of phraseology.——— *Should put away her husband*:—It is implied that, in our Saviour's judgement, wives and husbands have equal rights in reference to divorce, and in reference to all, therefore, that is implied in divorce. Josephus indeed says, "that while, according to the Jewish laws, it is lawful for a husband to "dissolve his marriage by giving a bill of divorce to his wife, yet it is not lawful "for a wife, who voluntarily departs from her husband, to be married to "another, unless her former husband renounce her." (*Antiq.* xv, 7, 10.) No doubt Josephus expressed the common opinion of his countrymen. But this opinion was founded on Deut. xxiv, 1—4, which merely brings into view a certain duty devolving on husbands, but does not on that account deny the equivalent rights of wives. As a matter of fact, Jewish wives, in ordinary circumstances, did not enjoy equivalent rights; but that matter of fact was founded, not on divine statute, but on a barbarous use-and-wont, which had descended from the days when right was arbitrarily merged in might. In marriage, however, as Richard Baxter remarks, the wife and the husband are equally "contractors." Among Greeks and Romans, in the age of our Lord, the wife's right of divorce was recognized; and whenever among the Jews the wife had the power, as well as the inclination, she asserted her right. (See Danz's Dissertation, *Uxor Maritum Repudians*, in *Meuschen's New Test.* pp. 677—701.)———*And be married to another*:—Or, as it stands in the modern critical editions, and in a great majority of the best manuscripts, *and should marry another*, (γαμήσῃ). The woman is recognized as not only *being married*, but as also actively *marrying.* Note the word *another*, that is, according to our Translation, *another husband.* But, in reality, the woman does not, according to our Saviour's supposition, marry *another husband.* She only marries *another man* who cannot be her *husband.* In the original the awkwardness is avoided by an idiom which is literally reproduced in Scotch and German, *and if she put away her 'man,' and marry another.* Purvey avoids the awkwardness by a free translation, *and if the wiif leveth hir housbonde and be weddid to*

13 [i] And they brought young children to him, [i] Mat. 19. 13. Luke 18. 15.
that he should touch them: and *his* disciples
rebuked those that brought *them*. 14 But when Jesus saw
*it*, he was much displeased, and said unto them, Suffer the
little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of

---

*another man.*———*She committeth adultery*:–It is not said *against him*, probably because it is in the case of the weaker sex, that the injury, as distinguished from the sin, of wanton divorce, is most severely felt.

Verses 13—16 constitute an exquisite paragraph, corresponding to Matthew xix, 13—15, and Luke xviii, 15—17.

Ver. 13. *And*:–On some unspecified part of the Saviour's route southward. ———*They brought little children to him*:–It would doubtless be the parents who brought them,—fatherly fathers, and motherly mothers. Their instincts assured them that he would be a lover of children, and they were convinced in their hearts that there would be some peculiar value in his benediction.——— *That he might touch them*:–They wished that he should lay his hand on their heads and bless them. They had faith that his touch would be more than mere symbolism. Must not his whole person be surcharged with "virtue"?———*But the disciples rebuked those who were bringing them*:–"The erroneous apostles," as Richard Baxter calls them, thought that the Great Rabbi would be annoyed, and his attention diverted from matters of greater importance than anything connected with little children. Any such thing would be, in their apprehension, as Petter remarks, "a small and leight matter." On the word translated *rebuked*, see chap. i, 25; iv, 39. It is here equivalent to *chid*.

Ver. 14. *But when Jesus saw it*:–The original expression (ἰδὼν δέ) does not imply, that any time elapsed before Jesus had cognizance of what was transpiring. It only implies that what follows the *seeing* in the narrative, also followed as an effect in the sequence of the narrated events. Jesus *saw what the disciples did*, and then was affected according to the peculiarity of their action, on the one hand, and the peculiarity of his own character, on the other.———*He was much displeased*:–The *much* is superfluous in translation, and is wanting in Luther, Tyndale, Coverdale, and the Geneva. It is also wanting in Matt. xx, 24; xxvi, 8; Mark xiv, 4, Luke xiii, 14; 2 Cor. vii, 11. The Rheims renders the expression thus, *he tooke it il*. The word may often, in its classical usage, be translated, *he was vexed*.———*And said to them, Suffer the little children to come to me*: *Suffer*, that is, *permit*,—*permit by letting go* (ἄφετε). The expression is applicable to the case of children who were eagerly making their way, on their own feet, to the Saviour.———*And*:–This conjunction—found in Matthew and Luke—is omitted in the texts of Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford. It is wanting in a large number of the uncial manuscripts, inclusive of the Vatican. It is more likely to have been intentionally added, than intentionally or unintentionally omitted.———*Forbid them not*:–Or rather, *Do not hinder them* (μὴ κωλύετε). That is the word which is given in the versions of Mace, Wakefield, Pr. Campbell, Norton, Alford. The disciples had been putting forth their hands to keep back the little ones. ———*For of such*:–That is, *of such little children as these*. The Saviour does not mean, *of persons like little children in disposition;* otherwise, as Richard

such is the kingdom of God. 15 Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God [j]as a little child, he shall not enter therein. 16 And he took them up in his arms, put *his* hands upon them, and blessed them.

[j] Psa. 131. 2. 1 Cor. 14. 20. 1 Pet. 2. 2.

17 And when he was gone forth into the way, [k]there

[k] Mat. 19. 16. Luke 18. 18.

---

Baxter says, "he might have taken up lambs or doves, and blessed them, and said *Of such is the kingdom of God.*" He refers to the little children who were there (comp. Acts xxii, 22; Rom. i, 32; 1 Cor. xvi, 16; Gal. v, 21); but not to them exclusively. All little children everywhere are embraced within the compass of his reference. (See *Comment.* on Matt. xix, 14.)———*Is the kingdom of God*:–The kingdom of heaven, in its privileges, *belongs to* little children. They are "in" it, and have a right through grace to its prerogatives. They will never be "far" or "not far" from it, unless they wilfully expatriate themselves, or be subjected to banishment because of rebellion. If they die in infancy, they will but ascend from a lower to a higher province, in which they will be nearer to the throne of the King.

VER. 15. *Verily I say unto you*:–That is, *I solemnly assure you.* The Saviour takes the opportunity of adding a remark that has reference to such as are not children.———*If any one should not receive the kingdom of God, as a little child, he shall not enter into it*:–While little children do not need voluntarily to *enter into* the kingdom of God, adults do; for by sin they have become expatriated. But as it is a spiritual kingdom, *to which* men can return without any local transference of their personality,—they may be said to *receive it*, as well as to *enter into it.* They allow it to enter into them, until they are absorbed within it, and assimilated by it. Or we may distinguish thus,—They *receive it*, so far as its principles are concerned: they *enter into it*, so far as its privileges are concerned. They must, however, receive it and enter into it, *in the spirit of little children*, who do not think of alleging any claim of merit, or presenting any price for their position and privileges.

VER. 16. *And he took them up in his arms*:–Infolding or clasping them. It is the same beautiful word that is used in chapter ix, 36, (ἐναγκαλισάμενος). Wycliffe has *biclippinge hem.*———*Put his hands upon them, and blessed them*:–Or, according to the collocation of the Sinaitic, Vatican, and Parisian manuscripts (ℵBC), and LΔ,—a collocation adopted by Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford,—*and blesses them, laying his hands upon them.* While the little ones were successively folded to his breast, he disengaged his right arm, laid his hand on the little head, and uttered his benediction. The word rendered *blesses* (κατευλόγει)–as adopted into the texts of Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, from the ancient uncial manuscripts which we have mentioned,—occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. It is stronger than the uncompounded verb, and "may," says Alford, "be rendered, *He fervently blessed them.*" The Saviour lifted up to his Father, in behalf of the little ones, the fervent desires of his heart, and thus *invoked* '*down*' *upon them a blessing.* See Matt. xix, 13.

VERSES 17—12 constitute a paragraph parallel to Matthew xix, 16—26 and Luke xviii, 18—27.

came one running, and kneeled to him, and asked him, Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life? 18 And Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou me good? *there is* [l] none good [m] but one, *that is,* [n] God. 19 Thou

[l] Psa. 15. 3.

[m] 1 Tim. 1. 17. 1 Tim. 6. 16. [n] Psa. 119. 68.

---

VER. 17. *And*:—At some unspecified period in his southward journey. ———*When he was gone forth into the way*: Or, more literally, *as he was going forth into the way*:—*the way, road, track,* or *route,* that led southward. Edgar Taylor translates, *as he was going forth 'along' the highway.* But the evangelist's expression denotes the action of our Lord, *in going from the house where he had been 'into' the highway.*———*One came running up, and kneeling to him, asked him*:—His mind had been "under concern" on a practical matter, and, hearing that the celebrated Galilean Rabbi was about to pass by, he had come with haste to get the benefit of his counsel.———*Good Master*: Literally, *Good Teacher.* He assumed that the Galilean Rabbi, of whose good deeds the whole country had been ringing, must be *good.* But perhaps, in the employment of such an epithet, there might be, as there sometimes is in our familiar English idiom, a germ of self-assumption,—such self-assumption as is ready enough to admit in others some excellency of motives, while no other superiority is conceded.———*What shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?* He was in a state of "anxiety" in reference to everlasting things. He had faith in a retributive future. And, desiring a state of bliss in the world to come, he wanted to know what would be necessary to secure that state. He was persuaded apparently that eternal life was not to be obtained *by purchase.* It was to be obtained *by divine allotment and will, by inheritance.* But he was also persuaded—and so far rightly—that subjective conditions required to be fulfilled, ere he would be "meet" to enter on possession, as a "portioner" or heir.———We have no reason to think that Mark intended to report, exhaustively, the whole language employed by the interrogator, and all the aspects of conversation that ensued. Hence the variations in Matthew's account. (Chap. xix, 16, 17. See *Commentary* in loc.)

VER. 18. *But Jesus said to him, Why dost thou call me good?*—Our Lord saw that the "young man" (Matt. xix, 20) only assumed that he was good; and, in the very facility with which he made the assumption, he bewrayed an exceedingly inadequate conception of the true import and importance of goodness. ———*There is none good but one, God*: Tyndale's translation is awkward, *There is no 'man' good but one, which is God.* Goodness,—moral and spiritual,—is divine. Absolute Goodness and God are one. God is impersonated goodness, just as he is impersonated love. Primarily, essentially, independently, none is good but God. When goodness is found in a creature, it is just a reflection of the moral glory of the Creator. It is godlikeness. The young man was not taking this lofty view of goodness; otherwise, before he called Jesus good, he would have taken some pains to ascertain how far there was in him, a reflection, or "express image," of the glory of the Divine Father. The Saviour is not repelling, however, as some have imagined, the notion of his own *sinlessness.* He is only criticizing the loose language, and loose ideas, of his interrogator, regarding that moral condition of spirit, which is the contradictory of sinfulness.

knowest the [o]commandments, Do not commit adultery, Do not kill, Do not steal, Do not bear false witness, Defraud not, Honour thy father and mother.
20 And he answered and said unto him, Master, [p]all

[o] Ex. 20.12-17. Deu.5.16-21. Rom. 13. 9.
[p] Isa. 58. 2. Phil. 3. 6.

---

Ver. 19. After uttering his mild rebuke, our Lord proceeds to answer the young man's question, by exhibiting the moral character requisite as "meetness" for the enjoyment of everlasting life. *Thou knowest the commandments, Do not commit adultery, Do not kill, Do not steal*:–There is considerable diversity in the manuscripts, as regards the relative position of these commandments. Lachmann, under the authority of the Vatican, puts *Do not commit adultery*, after *Do not kill*. The Syriac-Peshito version, again, puts *Do not kill*, after *Do not steal*. The Sinaitic manuscript (ℵ*), on the other hand, omits *Do not commit adultery* altogether. The order of the Received Text, and consequently of our Authorized Version, is the best supported.———*Do not bear false witness, Do not defraud, Honour thy father and thy mother*:–A good deal of debate has been raised in reference to the second of these three commandments. Beza and Lange suppose that it gathers up and generalizes all the preceding commandments, being equivalent to this,—*Do injury to no one.* Petter, Heupel, Fritzsche, Bloomfield, contend for something much more specific. They suppose that it is a return, under a particular phase, to "the eighth commandment,"—*Do not steal.* Hofmann, again, supposes that it bends forward to the next clause in the list, in which "the fifth commandment" is specified,—*Defraud not thy father and thy mother of the honour which is their due.* (*Schriftbeweis*, ii, 2, p. 365.) Owen (*Modes of Quotation*, p. 45) and Kuinöl suppose that there is a reference to the particular injunction contained in Lev. xix, 13, *Thou shalt not defraud thy neighbour, neither rob him*, or, as the Septuagint renders it, *Thou shalt not injure* (ἀδικήσεις) *thy neighbour, nor rob.* Meyer, again, supposes that the reference is to Deut. xxiv, 14, *Thou shalt not oppress a hired servant that is poor and needy*, which, in the Alexandrine manuscript, is rendered thus, *Thou shalt not withhold the hire* (ἀποστερήσεις μισθόν) *of the poor and needy.* It is far more likely, however, that the words are really, as Bishop Hammond expresses it, "St. Mark's rendering of the tenth commandment." And if so, we find in our Lord's specification of commandments, the complement of duties in the entire manward circle, or second table, of the Decalogue. He who covets what belongs to another, *has in his heart already deprived him of it.* The verb (ἀποστερήσῃς) that is rendered *defraud* in our version, and *begyle* in Coverdale, is too narrowly so rendered. It means to *deprive* of what is one's due, whether by "hook," "crook," or force, or in any other way. (See Wetstein *in loc.*) Le Clerc takes Hammond's view of the commandment, and so do Bengel, Wetstein, de Wette, Holden, Alexander, Bisping.

Ver. 20. *But he answered and said unto him*:–Or, as it is more briefly in both the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscript, *But he said to him.*———*Master*:–Literally *Teacher*, that is *Rabbi.*———*All these have I observed from my youth*:–Or more literally, *All these I observed from my youth.* He is thinking of his past life as a distinct unit of time, back on which he looks from the standpoint of the present. The word translated *observed*, or *kept*

these have I observed from my youth. 21 Then Jesus beholding him loved him, and said unto him, [q]One [q] Jas. 2. 10.

---

as it is in Matthew xix. 20, properly means *guarded*. The young man acted toward the commandments as *wards* committed to his keeping. So he thought at least; and to a certain extent correctly. So far as the letter of the law was concerned,—that letter which was incorporated in the political constitution of the Jewish polity, and which formed the groundwork of unchallengeable position in Jewish society,—the young man had kept the commandments. His outward demeanour had been irreproachable. (Compare Phil. iii, 6.)

VER. 21 *And Jesus beholding him*:—Fixing his eyes upon him, so as to read him.——*Loved him*:—Many of the older expositors, from Victor of Antioch downward, wondered at this statement. It surprised them that our Saviour should be represented as *loving* one who was not prepared to give up all on earth for the sake of the kingdom of heaven. Hence various attempts were made to find in the expression something less inward than real love. Some supposed that the words *loved him* meant *kissed him*. (See Casaubon's note and Wolf's.) Even Lightfoot hesitates to object to this interpretation. Others have supposed that it means, *spoke to him kindly*. So Casaubon, Elsner, de Dieu, Vater. Norton has a similar idea,—only he blends the phrase with the following expression *and said to him*, interpreting thus, —*affectionately said to him*. Others, again, maintain that the phrase means *pitied him*. Alexander says, "Most probably love, as in many other places, here denotes, not moral "approbation, nor affection founded upon anything belonging to the object, "but a sovereign and gratuitous compassion, such as leads to every act of "mercy upon God's part. The sense will then be, not that Jesus loved him "on account of what he said, or what he was, or what he did, but that, having "purposes of mercy towards him, he proceeded to unmask him to himself, "and to show him how entirely groundless, although probably sincere, was "his claim to have habitually kept the law. The Saviour's love is, then, men- "tioned, not as the effect of what precedes, but as the ground or motive of "what follows." It should, however, be borne in mind that those who love both wisely and well take cognizance invariably of lovable qualities in the objects of their love. It would not be to the glory of any Being to love the utterly unimportant, insignificant, and unlovely. Beauty of moral character may indeed be wanting,—but excellency of capability, or superiority of constitution, or some other beauty or worth, must be discernible, as an indispensable condition of such love as challenges the approbation of conscience, and the admiration of intelligence. Love of compassion is never absolutely separated from love of appreciation. Our Saviour's love would be no exception. He would discern in the young man not a little that was really amiable,—the result of the partial reception and reflection of gracious divine influences. There was ingenuousness for instance, and moral earnestness. There was restraint of the animal passions, and an aspiration of the spirit toward the things of the world to come. There was still, indeed, "one thing" that was wanting,—"one thing" that was wrong; and, in that "one thing" many things would be involved. But there were other things that were the fit objects

thing thou lackest: go thy way, [r] sell whatsoever [r] 1 Tim. 6. 9.
thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have [s] treasure in heaven: and come, take up the cross, [s] Mat. 6. 20.

of complacency.———*And said to him, One thing thou lackest*:-Or, *in one thing thou comest behind,—in one thing thou comest short* (Rom. iii, 23). Wycliffe's version is, *o thing failith to thee*.———*Go thy way*: Or simply, *Goo*, as Tyndale has it. The Saviour thus, instead of stating, categorically, *what was the one thing*, in which the young man *came behind*, tells him how to act, if he were willing and wishful to be set right.———*Sell whatsoever thou hast*:-This is not, as certain defenders of Roman Catholic monasticism have maintained, Patrizi for instance, *a counsel of superorogatory perfection*, in complying with which something more would be achieved than what was requisite for personal righteousness. Neither is it, as communistic theorists have contended, a rule of life for all the disciples of Christ in all ages. It was an injunction, addressed to a particular individual, and intended to meet his particular spiritual difficulty, that he might master the particular temptation, to which he was exposed, and before which he was in danger of succumbing. The same individual, if living in another age, and amid other circumstances, might probably have received some modification of the injunction. The one thing aimed at was, no doubt, the deliverance of the young man's heart from some subtle species of self-indulgence that endangered his soul. He was not realizing, we may presume, that he was *but a steward* of the property of the Great Proprietor. He was, in other words, overlooking the moral responsibilities of wealth,—the duties which it superinduces on its privileges.———*And give to the poor*: We need not imagine anything like indiscriminate or injudicious distribution. It is enough that the Saviour recognized that some people have too much of the world, and others too little; and that they who have too little should be the objects of an unceasing solicitude.———*And thou shalt have treasure in heaven*:-Thou shalt have riches of glory.———The righteousness of liberality, which is thus represented as rewardable with the riches of glory, is not the perfect and spotless righteousness of Systematic Theology. That perfect and spotless righteousness is the work of the Mediator, and the objective ground of forensic justification. But the righteousness of liberality is a single phase of that imperfect personal righteousness of the believer, which is, notwithstanding its imperfection, the indispensable moral meetness for the employments and enjoyments of the heavenly state. See on verse 27.———*And come*:-Very literally, *and (come) hither*.———*Take up the cross and follow me*: The words *take up the cross* are wanting in very high and ancient authorities,—the Sinaitic, Vatican, Ephraemi, and Cambridge manuscripts (ℵBCD),—as also in Δ, and the Vulgate version. Tregelles and Tischendorf have thrown them out of their texts. Mill's critical instinct led him of old to condemn them (*Prol.* §. 407). It is likely, as both Mill and Tischendorf remark, that they have been marginally added from chapter viii, 34. Compare Matt. xvi, 24, and Luke ix, 23. It was enough, we may presume, that, in the first instance at least, it should be laid on the conscience of the young man to attach himself to the Galilean Rabbi, as a personal follower.

and follow me. 22 And he was sad at that saying, and went away grieved: for he had great possessions.

23 And Jesus looked round about, and saith unto his disciples, How hardly shall they that have riches [t] enter into the kingdom of God! 24 And the disciples were astonished at his words. But Jesus answereth again, and saith unto them, Children, how hard is it for them that

---

[t] 1. Tim. 6. 9.

Ver. 22. *But he, saddened at the saying*: The word rendered *sad*, or *saddened*, (στυγνάσας), is applied to the sky in Matthew xvi. 3, and is there translated, in our Authorized Version, *lowering*. A gloom came over the young man's heart, and threw its shadow on his face. *Disconfforted* is Tyndale's rendering; *chagrin'd*, Rilliet's; *fal sori*, Purvey's.——*Went away grieved*: Or *grieving* rather, *sorrowing*. This present participle, as distinguished from the past of the preceding clause, denotes the grief that continued after the first shock of vexation.——*For he had great possessions*: Wycliffe's rendering is, *For-soth he was hauynge many possessiouns*. The possessions which he was holding (ἦν ἔχων) were numerous (πολλά).

Ver. 23. *And Jesus looked round about*:—Withdrawing his eyes from the young man, who had now turned away.——*And saith to his disciples*:—After having surveyed them round and round.——*How hardly shall they who have riches enter into the kingdom of God!*—*How hardly*, that is, *with what difficulty*. The expression *who have riches* is literally, *who have 'the' riches*. The article was somewhat perplexing to Fritzsche; but he hit, apparently, on the true explanation. The Saviour had it in his option either to consider *riches* indefinitely, or to take into account *the definite sum-total of the riches of the world*. He chooses the latter view. The few, who divide among themselves *these riches*, are in general regarded by their fellow-men as "the favourites of fortune." But their position has its drawbacks as well as its advantages. While they have great facilities for getting good and doing good, they are encompassed with great temptations.

Ver. 24. *And the disciples were amazed at his words*: They had been accustomed to think little of the dangers, and much of the advantages of wealth. ——*But Jesus answereth again, and saith unto them*:—The *again* grated on the ear of Fritzsche, and he struck it out of his text. Unwarrantably, although it is wanting in the Alexandrine manuscript and a few unimportant cursives. The evangelist did not intend it to qualify the word *answereth*, but rather the remainder of the introductory expression,—*But Jesus again says to them in reply*. He *replied* to what was *implied* in their amazement; and in his reply he repeated,—though under a variation,—the idea which he had expressed in what goes immediately before.——*Children*: His affection overflowed, as he realized that the objects of his solicitude were spiritually young and inexperienced. All those of them, who were genuine, had in them a true spiritual life, which they had derived from Himself. Comp. chap. ii, 5; v, 34; John xiii, 33; xiv, 18.——*How hard is it for them that trust in riches to enter into the kingdom of God*:—Might we not rather have expected our Lord to have said,—*How hard it is for them "who have riches"?* And this is really what is said in the Æthiopic version. Some copies of the Old-Latin version (c, ff$^2$) have

trust in riches to enter into the kingdom of God! 25 It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God.

---

simply,—*How hard it is for a rich man* (divitem). Another Old-Latin copy (a) has alternatively, *How hard it is for those who have riches or who trust in them.* Such variations in the Old-Latin copies almost suggest that the Received Text must contain an ancient marginal annotation. And then, in another Old-Latin copy (k), the text runs thus, *How hard it is to enter into the Kingdom of God!* And this is the reading that is actually found in a certain important Coptic manuscript (*petr.* 3). It is too the reading of the important San Gallensis manuscript (Δ). And it is likewise the reading of the two most ancient and most important manuscripts yet known, the Sinaitic and the Vatican (ℵB). Tischendorf has accepted it. Rightly, no doubt. The Saviour, indeed, had his eye, specifically, upon the rich; but for a moment he enlarges his field of vision, and makes the more generic statement, *How difficult it is to enter the kingdom of God!* What barriers are in every one's way! Hence the tenderness of his address, *Children!* It would, when one considers it, be strange that he should have said, *How difficult it is "for those who trust in riches" to enter into the kingdom of God!* Those, *who trust in riches,* are very far indeed from being meet for the kingdom of heaven. They are most unmeet. Their god is gold. It is at the shrine of Mammon that they perform the rites of adoration. The hand, therefore, of an annotator is surely bewrayed in the reading of the Received Text. He wanted to explain wherein the danger of riches consists. His explanation is admirable. The rich *are* apt to "trust in their riches" for their happiness. It is self-evident. But for that very reason, it seems almost preposterous to suppose that our Saviour would, in the solemnity of the case before us, utter the commonplace, as if it were something of very deep significance.

VER. 25. *It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God*:—A fine, bold, hieroglyphic, hyperbolical, way of speaking, that need impose upon no one who has a spark of poetry in his soul. The key to its import is hung at the girdle of common sense. Southey caught its spirit,—

> "I would ride the camel,
> Yea, leap him flying, through the needle's eye,
> As easily as such a pampered soul
> Could pass the narrow gate."

"The text," he says, "is gospel wisdom." The Saviour intended to represent vividly and memorably the extraordinary difficulty of discharging the responsibilities, and overcoming the temptations, of riches. The expression *the eye of 'a' needle,* is, in the original, as it was lying before our translators, *the eye of 'the' needle.* Such too is Tischendorf's reading,—supported by the Vatican manuscript, and other considerable authorities. A preponderance of the best authorities, however, inclusive of the Sinaitic, Alexandrian, Ephraemi, and Cambridge Manuscripts (ℵACD), omit both the articles,—*a needle's eye;* and this is Lachmann's and Tregelles's reading. The attempt to substitute *cable* for *camel,* patronized even by Calvin, and the kindred attempt to explain

26 And they were astonished out of measure, saying among themselves, Who then can be saved? 27 And Jesus looking upon them saith, With men *it is* impossible, but

---

away the phrase *a needle's eye*, as if it must mean something far less impervious to a camel than the actual *eye of a needle*, proceed on an entire and prosaic misconception of the sacred imagery. (See *Commentary on Matthew*, xix, 24.)

VER. 26. *But they were astonished beyond measure*:—Or, exceedingly astounded. They were confounded.———*Saying among themselves*:—Or, more literally, *to themselves*, that is, *to one another*,—but in the hearing of the Master.———*Who then can be saved?*—A free translation, but correct. The expression, if very literally rendered, would run thus,—'*And' who can be saved?* It has been perplexing to many scholars, to Grotius among the rest. It is quite an intelligible idiom, however,—resting, like many others, on a faithful representation of an actual mental experience. The astounded disciples advanced—not *oppositively* as Fritzsche supposed, but *continuatively* in the direction of the train of thought that had been started by the Saviour. And as they thus advanced, they were shut up to the question, *who is able to be saved?* Their minds had gone beyond the special case of the rich. They saw—as the Saviour had indicated in verse 24—that the temptations which assail the rich are just a particular species of the temptations that assail, generically, all without exception. All, in all circumstances, are liable to insidious temptations to selfishness. And selfishness is the essence of unrighteousness.

VER. 27. *And Jesus, looking upon them*: The tenderness of his heart looking forth from his eyes.———*Saith, with men it is impossible*:—*With men*, that is, *on the side of men, on the part of men*. It does not mean, as Fritzsche strangely supposed, *in the judgement of men*. When the Saviour says, *It is impossible*, he means, *It is impossible to work out salvation*, in the sense, namely, of working out such a perfect righteousness as would be the meritorious cause of salvation. When the Saviour spoke of the difficulty of rich men in particular, and of men in general, he had reference not to the righteousness, which is the "meritorious cause" of everlasting glory, but to the righteousness which is the "moral meetness" of the soul for the enjoyment of such glory. The two righteousnesses are intimately inter-related, and, in the case of unfallen beings, are but two aspects of one identical reality. In the case of sinful beings, like men, however, they are distinct realities. The righteousness, which is the meritorious cause of everlasting glory, was wrought out and brought in by "Jesus Christ the righteous," and is for ever in Him. It is forensically imputed to those who believe in Him. But the righteousness which is moral meetness for the enjoyment of everlasting glory is wrought out in the believer's heart and life, under the mighty impulse of the Holy Spirit of God. It is the righteousness of which mention is made in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v, 6, 20). The other is the righteousness of which Paul speaks when he says that "the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, for *therein is the righteousness of God*—(or, the work of the Saviour)—*revealed from faith to faith.*" (Rom. i, 16, 17.) He who looks merely in the direction of the requisite subjective righteousness, with all its inherent imperfections, cannot but say, in despair, "Who can be saved?" And

not with God: for with God [u]all things are possible. [u] Gen. 18. 14. Job. 42. 2. Jer. 32. 17. Luke 1. 37.
28 [v]Then Peter began to say unto him, Lo, we have left all, and have followed thee. 29 And Jesus answered and said, Verily I say unto you, [v] Mar. 19. 27. Luke 18. 28.
There is no man that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands,

---

if the Saviour be speaking to one who is looking exclusively in that direction, he cannot but say, "with men salvation is impossible"—absolutely impossible. ———*But not with God*:–It is possible for God to save even the unrighteous, and to "justify the ungodly," (Rom. iv, 5), for it is possible for Him to provide the perfect righteousness, which is the meritorious cause of salvation.——— *For all things are possible with God*:–All *things*, all '*thinks*.' All that man *can think* as possible, is possible with God. *All that does not involve a contradiction in thought is possible with God.* It is impossible to think that God should cease to be God, or that infinite wisdom should become infinite folly, or that badness should be goodness, or that twice two should be three. But it is not impossible to think that a Divine Saviour should appear in human form, and magnify the law, and bring in an everlasting righteousness, for men who have been unrighteous.

Verses 28—31 constitute an appendage to the preceding paragraph. Corresponding appendages are found in Matt. xix, 27—30; Luke xviii, 28—30.

Ver. 28. *Then*:–There is no *then* or *and* or *but* in a majority of the oldest manuscripts. Griesbach,—as well as Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles,—omits all forms of the conjunction.———*Peter began to say to him*:–Observe the *began*. It is one of Mark's peculiarities to note *beginnings*. He leaves the mind to go forward from them, of its own accord. See chap. ii, 23; iv, 1; vi, 2.———*Lo, we have left all, and have followed thee*:–We have let all go. Unlike the rich young man, we have surrendered all that would be a fetter to us in attending on thee,—we have surrendered all, that we may follow thee from place to place, and be moulded by thee for the work which may be given us to do in connection with thy kingdom. Peter was sincere, but too retroverting toward self. See Matt. xix, 27.

Ver. 29. *And Jesus answered and said*:–Or, according to the simple reading of the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts, accepted by Tischendorf, *Jesus said* (ἔφη ὁ Ἰησοῦς).———*Verily I say to you*:–That is, *I solemnly assure you.*——— *There is no one who hath left house, or brothers, or sisters, or father, or mother*:–There is difference among the manuscripts regarding the sequence of the words *father* and *mother*. Tischendorf and Tregelles reverse the order of the received text. They follow the Vatican manuscript. The Received Text has the support of the Sinaitic.———*Or wife*:–This item is omitted by both the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts (ℵB), as also by DΔ, 1, 66, and the Vulgate, Coptic, and Armenian versions, and many copies of the Old-Latin. Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford throw it out. It is a matter of no moment, whether it be formally retained, or formally excluded. It is virtually included; for it is evident that the relationships specified are specified representatively.———*Or children*:–Tyndale in both his editions has *other children*, thus interestingly presenting to view the full original form of the

for my sake, and the gospel's, 30 but he shall [w]receive [w] 2 Chr. 25. 9.
an hundredfold now in this time, houses, and brethren, and sisters, and mothers, and children, and lands, with [x]persecutions; and in the world to come eternal [x] 2 Tim. 3. 12.

---

disjunctive conjunction *or*. Compare the German *oder*.———*Or lands*:—Literally *fields*, that is, properties or possessions. The specific for the generic. ———*For my sake, and the gospel's*:-Or, according to a better authenticated reading, *for the sake of me, and for the sake of the gospel*. The Saviour formally distinguishes between himself and the Gospel; and yet, with lofty self-consciousness, he realized that he and the Gospel were inseparable. Without him the Gospel would be nothing. Without the Gospel, men would know nothing of him.

VER. 30. *But he shall receive*:—Principal Campbell and Norton translate, *who shall not receive*. Very literally it is, *unless he should receive*. The idea is,—that it is in no case a fact that any one has left all for Christ's sake, *unless it be at the same time true that he shall receive* sublime compensation.———*An hundredfold*:—A definite for an indefinite proportion. The meaning is, that the compensation will be far more than double, triple, quadruple, &c. It will mount up to *a hundredfold* as it were,—a truly glorious reward.———*Now in this time*: Even on earth the reward will be transcendent.———*Houses, and brothers, and sisters, and mothers*:-There is no *and fathers*,—the omission being apparently without any specific intention. Several manuscripts, and Fritzsche, read *and mother and father*.———*And children, and fields*: It is with beautiful delicacy that our Saviour refrains from inserting as an item, *and wives;* and thus Julian's scoff, referred to by Theophylact, that the Christian has the promise of a hundred wives, had no vestige of foundation but in his own foul imagination. In the preceding verse the connective between the items is *or*, here it is *and*. There is great propriety in the exchange, for here the Saviour is giving, as it were, *an inventory of the divine fulness of blessing*, so far as it is available for the most ample compensation of those who have suffered loss. And there is, besides, in the spiritual sphere of things, a kind of coalescence, or mutual involution, of blessed relationships. The sum-total of them all belongs to every true disciple. He gets a hundredfold more bliss, even "now in this time," than he loses in the surrender of house, or brother, or sister, or mother, or father, or wife, or children, or fields.———*With persecutions* (μετὰ διωγμῶν):-It is grandly added. The idea is not, *in the midst of persecutions*. Still less is it, as Kuinol imagined, *after persecutions*. The preposition employed never means *after*, when connected with the genitive case. And it was in vain that Heinsius, le Clerc, and Wetstein conjectured that the evangelist had written in his autograph, *after persecution* (μετὰ διωγμόν). We must occupy a loftier standpoint of observation, although Campbell and Fritzsche, as well as Heinsius, le Clerc, and Wetstein, had difficulty in reaching it. The Saviour represents *persecutions* as, in some wonderful manner, belonging to the inventory of the believer's blessings on earth. There is a certain lofty sense, in which it can be said, "if ye suffer for righteousness' sake, *happy are ye*,"—"*rejoice and be exceedingly glad*." Compare Matt. v, 10—13; Phil. i, 29; 1 Pet. iii, 14; iv, 12—16.———*And in the world*

life. 31 But [y] many *that are* first shall be last; and the last first. [y] Mat. 20. 16. Luke 13. 30.

32 [z] And they were in the way going up to Jerusalem; and Jesus went before them: and they were amazed; and as they followed, they were afraid. And he took [z] Mat. 20. 17. Luke 18. 31.

---

*to come everlasting life*: Which, with its "eternal weight of glory," makes up for all the Christian's trials, not merely a hundred times over, but thousands of thousands of times. The phrase *in the world to come*, is literally *in the age to come*. It is the age of the Messiah's undisputed reign, coincident with the age of man's perfected glory. It will be the beginning of an endless series of corresponding ages.

VER. 31. *But many first shall be last, and the last first*:—One of our Saviour's seed-thoughts. (See Matt. xix, 30; xx, 16; Luke xiii, 30.) The contrast of what is, and of what ought to be, is not greater than the contrast of what is, and what shall be. In the great sphere of the world at large, many are at present uppermost, who shall by and by be undermost. And even in the hemisphere of Christian society many have pressed forward to the front, who shall by and by be consigned to the rear. Not a few of the noblest and wisest and best have been pushed aside into corners and hidden places by the more bustling, self-asserting, and self-elevating. But by and by the tables will be divinely turned, and every one will be found, high or low, in his proper niche. In the pyramid of the glorified, it will not be, mayhap, the highest dignitaries of the church, or the most applauded scholars, or the most splendid orators, who will be found at the apex. Perhaps not even Peter, James, or John, will be "first."

VERSES 32—34 constitute a little paragraph corresponding to Matt. xx, 17—19, and Luke xviii, 31—33.

VER. 32. *And they were in the way going up to Jerusalem*:—The scene with the rich young man happened while they were going out *into the highway* (verse 17). Now they had reached the highway, *and were in it*, with their faces set toward Jerusalem.———*And Jesus went before them*:—Or rather, *And Jesus was going before them*,—pressing on, with high resolve, in the direction of the final scenes. He foresaw all: and yet marched on unflinchingly toward the conflict,—"for the joy that was set before him." (Heb. xii, 2.) ———*And they were amazed*:—Or, *astounded*. It is the same verb that occurs in verse 24. The majesty and heroism of his bearing, as he strode along in advance, wrapt in his own lofty meditations, struck them as something extraordinary. They were *confounded*. Principal Campbell, very unhappily, renders the expression, *a panic seized them*.———*And as they followed, they were afraid*:—This and the preceding clause Wilke arbitrarily supposed to be "a double gloss" (*Urevangelist*, p. 485). But what Grotius said in his day, may still be said by any judicious critic,—"I see no reason for doubting the reading,"—so far at least as its entirety or substance is concerned. The Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts (ℵB), however, as also C*LΔ and 1, instead of *and as they followed*, read *but they who were following* (οἱ δὲ ἀκολουθοῦντες) *were afraid*. It is no doubt the correct, as it is, at first sight at least, the more difficult reading. Ewald, Tregelles, Tischendorf, approve of it. The

again the twelve, and began to tell them what things should happen unto him, 33 *saying,* Behold, we go up to Jerusalem; [a]and the Son of man shall be delivered unto the chief priests, and unto the scribes: and they shall condemn him to death, and shall deliver him to the Gentiles: 34 and they shall mock him, and shall scourge him, and shall spit upon him, and shall kill him: and the third day he shall rise again.

[a] Chap. 8. 31.

35 [b]And James and John, the sons of Zebedee,

[b] Mat. 20. 20.

---

evangelist distinguishes between the apostles who would be nearest to our Lord, though at a distance, and the miscellaneous crowd who had been looking on wistfully, and listening as they had opportunity, and "following." To them the Saviour was an impenetrable Mystery. He was entirely unique and unearthly. And, as he strode along sublimely, in advance even of his chosen disciples, their reverence rose up into a weird feeling of awe, under which they began to tremble and be afraid. "Who can tell," they would be thinking, "what is portended by the appearance of such a Being?"———*And he took again the twelve*:—*The twelve*, as distinguished from those referred to in the immediately preceding clause. Jesus *took them "to himself."* Such is the import of the word. He gathered them around him, apart from the rest of the "following." He took them *again*. This *again* does not refer to the repetitive reference to the coming events, which are specified in what follows. It refers to the fact that, after he had advanced for a time, on the highway, apart and alone, *he rejoined his apostles.*———*And began to tell them the things that were about to happen to him*: He had done so before, but they had only the dimmest apprehension of what he meant. (Chaps. viii, 31; ix, 31.) They needed "line upon line,—here a little, there a little."

VER. 33. Here follows an abstract of what he said to them.———*Behold, we are going up to Jerusalem, and the Son of man shall be delivered up to the chief priests and the scribes*:—An informal way of referring to the supreme Jewish Council or Sanhedrim. The *elders* might also have been specified. (See chap. viii, 31.) But they were, so to speak, the lay element, and, in ecclesiastical cases, would be dominated by the more ecclesiastical members.———*And they shall condemn him to death, and shall deliver him up to the Gentiles*:—The Romans, to be by them ignominiously executed.

VER. 34. *And they shall mock him*:—*They*, the Gentiles to wit.———*And shall scourge him, and shall spit upon him*:—The manuscripts ℵBCLΔ, and the Vulgate, Coptic, Jerusalem-Syriac, and Æthiopic versions, read these clauses in reverse order. So Tregelles and Tischendorf.———*And shall kill him; and the third day he shall rise again*:—*The third day*, or rather, *after three days*. Such is the reading of the best manuscripts (ℵBCDLΔ) and of the great majority of the Old-Latin codices. It is approved of by Griesbach, and received into the text by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford. The meaning of the two phrases, when they are looked at from the standpoint of Jewish idiomatic phraseology, is identical. See chaps. viii, 31; ix, 31.

VERSES 35—40 exhibit a strange freak of ambition on the part of the two disciples, James and John, who seem to have thought that a momentous crisis in

come unto him, saying, Master, we would that thou shouldest do for us whatsoever we shall desire. 36 And he said unto them, What would ye that I should do for you? 37 They said unto him, Grant unto us that we may sit, one on thy right hand, and the other on thy left hand, in thy glory. 38 But Jesus said unto them, Ye know not what ye ask: can ye drink of the [c]cup that I drink of? and be [c] Chap. 14. 36.

---

our Lord's history was at hand. A corresponding paragraph occurs in Matt. xx, 20—23.

VER. 35. *And*:—At some subsequent stage of their progress southwards. ———*James and John, the sons of Zebedee, approach him, saying to him*:—This repetitive expression "*to him*," though not occurring in the Received Text, is found in the manuscripts ℵBCDLΔ, and is no doubt genuine.———*Master*:—Or *Rabbi*. Literally *Teacher*. See chapter ix, 5.———*We would that thou shouldest do for us whatsoever we shall desire*:—Or rather, *We desire that thou shouldest do for us whatsoever we should ask (of thee)*:—The pronoun *of thee* (σέ) is found in the manuscripts ℵABCLΔ, and is doubtless genuine. The phrase *we desire that*, if very literally rendered, would be, *We desire in order that*, that is, *We have a desire, the aim of which is, that whatever we should ask, thou shouldest do for us.* The whole expression just means,—*We have a request to prefer to thee.*

VER. 36. *And he said to them, what do you desire me to do for you?*—The reading is a little perplexed in the oldest manuscripts; but the meaning is obvious. Our Lord wished the two disciples to spread out, under the light of his observation and of their own reflection, what was lying in their hearts.

VER. 37. *And they said to him, grant to us, that we may sit, one at thy right hand, and one at thy left, in thy glory*:—The request was certainly more honest than modest. Apprehending that some great apocalypse was at hand, they seem to have had it in view to steal a march on Peter,—their most formidable rival for the primacy. They were sure that their Lord must be a King, though at present in disguise. In imagination they saw the disguise thrown off; and, lo, he is seated on a gorgeous throne, surrounded with all the insignia of royal state. They wish to bask in his immediate sunshine, and to be the highest of the high who should be privileged to surround his person. The expression, *at thy right hand, and at thy left*, is, in the original, *from thy right (parts), and from thy left*. It is an idiom, as is also the form of the phrase in our Authorized Version and in Tyndale, '*on' thy right hand, and* '*on' thy left*. Wycliffe's translation is picturesque, *Gyve to us that we sitten, the toon at thy right half, and the tothir at the left, in thi glorie.*

VER. 38. *But Jesus said to them, Ye know not what ye ask*:—Ye know not what is involved in your request. The degree of exaltation in ultimate glory is not to be a matter of capricious, or arbitrary determination. It must be regulated by the degree of the spirit of self-sacrifice during probation.———*Are ye able to drink the cup which I drink?*—When the Saviour says, *which I drink*, he regards *his present* as extending into *his future*. He might have said, *which I shall drink*, for although he was drinking already, he had not yet reached the dregs of the draught. See Matt. xx, 22. The *cup*, to which he refers, was the cup with the bitter potion in it, the bitter death-potion which he ultimately

baptized with the [d] baptism that I am baptized with? 39 And they said unto him, We can. And Jesus said unto them, [e] Ye shall indeed drink of the cup that I drink of; and with the baptism that I am

[d] Luke 12. 50.

[e] John 17. 14. Mat. 10. 25.

---

drained. (Compare chap. xiv, 36; Jo. xviii, 11; Heb. ii, 9.)———*And*: In a majority of the best manuscripts, inclusive of ℵBC*D, it is *or* instead of *and*. Such too is the reading of the Old-Latin, Vulgate, Coptic, Armenian versions, and the margin of the Philoxenian-Syriac.———*To be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with*:—Rather a peculiar expression, and explained by Campbell, Bleek, Meyer, Grimm, as denoting *immersing*, or *immerging, and consequent whelming*, in calamities;—*Can ye bear to be plunged into the trials into which I am plunged, and which are about to overwhelm me?* Or, as Petter explains, "Are ye able and fit to be dipped or drenched in those deep waters of affliction, pains, and miseries, in which I must shortly be drenched?" Principal Campbell's version is, *Can ye undergo an immersion, like that which I must undergo?* It is more likely, however, that the word *baptism* has, not its etymological, but its conventional Palestinian import, (see chap. vii, 4), so that the idea of *purgation* or *purification* is brought into view,—*Can ye endure the purifying ordeal through which I am passing, and which is just about to reach its climax in my experience?* Meyer objects that the idea of a *purifying ordeal* was not applicable to our Lord. Unreasonably. There was indeed no personal impurity in his character. He "knew no sin" (2 Cor. v, 21). As he passed through the ordeal, not the least atom of alloy was discovered. He stood the test. He came out of the fiery trial victorious. But it *was* a fiery trial, a most searching test and ordeal. It was, in a peculiar sense, *a baptism of fire*, or, to change the figure, *a salting with fire* (chap. ix, 49). It burned into his inmost sensibility, and produced "agony" (Luke xxii, 44). He willingly endured it, and came out "perfected through sufferings" (Heb. ii, 10). He now asked James and John *if they could endure such a baptism of fire.*

Ver. 39. *And they said to him, We are able*:—They did not, we may be sure, think of any nice psychological distinctions between *ability* and *willingness*. They just meant that they had sufficient strength of attachment to their Lord's person and cause, to nerve them for any preliminary ordeal. They would not flinch from enduring, along with him, any amount of trial, however formidable or fiery, through which it might be requisite to pass, while he was on his way to his throne. They were sincere, we need not doubt, in this profession.———*And Jesus said to them, Ye shall indeed drink of the cup that I drink of*:—Or, more literally, *The cup indeed which I drink ye shall drink.* The prospective particle rendered *indeed* (μέν) is omitted in the Sinaitic, Vatican, and Parisian manuscripts (ℵBC), and by Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford. If it be retained it looks forward to the antithetic *but* of the following verse. The two ambitious disciples would have to drink the same bitter potion which the Lord was drinking,—so far namely as was possible to them in their circumstances. They would have to suffer, as he suffered,—so far as such suffering was a possibility to them. There were indeed elements of trial, which were peculiar to our Lord in his peculiar position, and in virtue of his peculiar personality and character. And there would be elements of suffering on their part in which

baptized withal shall ye be baptized: 40 but to sit on my right hand and on my left hand is not mine to give; but *it shall be given to them* for whom it is [f]prepared. 41 And when the ten heard *it*, they began to

[f] Mat. 25. 34. John 14. 2. Heb. 11. 16.

---

their Lord would not be able to share. No two beings in the universe are absolutely alike, or in absolutely identical condition. But, to a large extent, as Jesus was "in this world," and treated, so would they be, and be treated.———*And with the baptism, with which I am baptized, ye shall be baptized*:–So far as essential differences in personality and relationship admitted.

Ver. 40. *But to sit at my right hand, and at my left*: Instead of *and*, it is *or* in the manuscripts ℵBDLΔ, and in almost all of the Old-Latin codices, as also in the Coptic and Gothic versions. So Dav. Schulz, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles. It is a matter, apparently, of but little moment whether the standpoint of observation be disjunctive or conjunctive.———*Is not mine to give*:–An expression that has unnecessarily perplexed many who had high ideas of the Lord's sovereignty. It was an old perplexity, and hence the Vulgate version and the Æthiopic, and many copies of the Old-Latin, add the pronoun *to you*, as a conducting rod to draw aside the emphasis of the negation. Patrizi contends for it. No such conducting rod, however, is required. The Saviour is speaking popularly, and *from* or *to* the standpoint of his petitioners. They thought that by an arbitrary act of will the Lord might confer on them the honour which they desired. The Saviour denies to himself the prerogative which they ascribed to him. He denies it, that is to say, as apprehended by them. He tells them that it was not his to put forth any such arbitrary act as they had been imagining. The highest posts of honour were to be assigned on a totally different principle, in which the arbitrary will of the Sovereign did not at all come into play.———*But (it shall be given to them) for whom it has been prepared*:–The expression is fragmentary in the original, being intended to suggest, to such as were at the right standpoint of thought, more than it plainly declared. The Father had a plan in reference to the honours of the Kingdom. It was perfect and unalterable. According to it the chief places were disposed of (in purpose), and could be given to no others. The lowliest would be the loftiest. They who gave up most would get most. He who goes nearest in time to Christ the crucified, shall get nearest in eternity to Christ the glorified. See verses 41—45.

Verses 41—45 constitute an appended paragraph, which corresponds to Matt. xx, 24—28, and Luke xxii, 25—27.

Ver. 41. *And when the ten heard it*:–We know not how. Perhaps they had noticed the approach to the Saviour of the two disciples, along with their mother (Matt. xx, 20), and had suspected their errand, and pressed them for an explanation of the private interview.———*They began to be much displeased with James and John*:–Literally, *concerning James and John*. The verb rendered *to be much displeased* simply means, as the Rheims has it, *to be displeased* (see verse 14), or, *to be indignant*, as Fritzsche and Grimm render it, or *to be moved with indignation*,—a rendering which it receives in Matt. xx, 24. Principal Campbell, merging the word *began*, translates the whole phrase thus,

be much displeased with James and John. 42 But Jesus called them *to him*, and saith unto them, Ye [g] know
[g] Luke 22. 25.
that they which [1] are accounted to rule over the
[1] Or, *think good*
Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and their great ones exercise authority upon them. 43 But so shall it not be among you: but [h] whosoever will be great among
[h] Chap. 9. 35. Mat. 20. 26. Luke 9. 48.

---

*conceived indignation.* So Norton, *they were angry.* But there is significancy in the *began.* Mark delighted to note the beginnings of things (see verse 28), and, in the case before us, it is natural to suppose that our Saviour interposed before the altercation had time to rise high.

VER. 42. *But* (δὲ): It is *And* (καὶ) in a majority of the best manuscripts, and in the modern critical texts.———*Jesus called them to him, and says to them, Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles*:–The expression rendered *they which are accounted to rule over*, and by Grotius, *they who have the honour to rule*, (οἱ δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν), literally means *they who seem to rule.* It does not signify simply, *they who rule* (Matt. xx, 25), as Hombergk, Heumann, Rosenmuller, Kuinol, Norton, Edgar Taylor, suppose. Nor does it necessarily bring into doubt the fact of their rule. Strictly speaking, it neither admits nor denies the fact (Gal. ii, 6). It simply allows *an apparent reality.* Some realities are apparent, or appear, just because they are realities. In other cases, unrealities, though mere delusions, have all the appearance of realities. The persons referred to by our Lord *appeared to rule.* Casaubon, Meyer, Bisping, suppose that the expression means that their rule was *obvious, evident, admitted.* But it seems more likely that our Lord leaves the question of the reality undetermined,—more especially as the word rendered *rule* brings the notion of *firsthood*, or *primacy*, into view. It is a legitimate question, certainly, whether they who seem to be the primates and princes of the Gentiles are really the first and the most princely. Wetstein supposes that the expression is intended to represent the Gentile rulers as but imposing on themselves, when they seemed to themselves to be lords, while they were really moral serfs, or slaves. Fritzsche, without accepting any such contrast, supposes that the expression means, *they who assume to themselves the position of rulers, who think that they rule.* But our Lord simply admits that the persons to whom he refers *seem*, so far as appearances go, *to be first and chief.*———*Exercise lordship over them*:–*Lord it over them, lord it down on them* (κατακυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν). They keep themselves exalted over the others,—who are, in relation to them, *subjects, subjected, subjacent.* ———*And their great ones*:–Their *magnates.* They are great in certain respects,—although some of the finest phases of greatness may be entirely wanting.———*Exercise authority upon them*:–Not so much '*up*'-*on* them, as '*down*'-*on* them, (κατεξουσιάζουσιν,—a verb unknown in classical Greek).

VER. 43. *But so shall it not be among you*:–Or more literally, *But not so shall it be among you.* In certain very important manuscripts (ℵBC*DLΔ), and the Vulgate version, and many of the Old-Latin codices, it is *But not so is it* (ἐστίν), instead of *But not so shall it be* (ἔσται). It is, that is to say, rather the *constitution*, than the *law*, of the kingdom of heaven, that is expressed.

you, shall be your minister: 44 and whosoever of you will be the chiefest, shall be servant of all. 45 For even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, [i] but to minister, and [j] to give his life a ransom for [k] many.

[i] John 13. 14. Phil. 2. 7.

[j] Isa. 53. 5. Dan. 9. 26. Gal. 4. 5. 1 Tim. 2. 6. 2 Pet. 2. 1. [k] Isa. 53. 12. Mat. 26. 28. Rom. 5. 19.

———*But whosoever will be great among you*:-*Will be great*, or *would be great*, or *may wish to be great.*———*Shall be your minister*:-Your *deacon* (διάκονος). Greatness in the kingdom of heaven consists in *doing*, rather than in *being*, and in doing for others, rather than for self. No man has a right to be his own End. While it is the case that he is an End to himself, it is not the case that he is his own chief End, or the End that lies immediately underneath the chief. There is a hierarchy of Ends. And the man, who seeks to make himself his own principal End, is an inverted pyramid.

VER. 44. *And whosoever would be chief among you*:-Your foremost man as it were, your "first," your primate.———*Shall be servant of all*:-*Of all*, mark. The width of the ministry determines the degree of the majesty.

VER. 45. *For even the Son of man did not come to be ministered unto, but to minister*:-To act as a "deacon" to men, (διακονῆσαι). He came *not to be served, but to serve.* So far as he is a Mediator, he sought not "his own things," but men's. In teaching, it was not renown as a Teacher, that was his aim, but men's instruction. In giving an example, it was not his own fame, as an Exemplar, which he sought, but men's elevation. In reigning, it is not his own glory that he desires, but men's prosperity and bliss. In atoning, see next clause. There are, indeed, relations more comprehensive than those of mediatorship, in which he, who is "God over all, blessed for ever," must find his final End in Himself. In the sphere of these relations it is his pleasure *to be served*, and not *to serve.* But there is no sphere whatever, in which he will ever consider it to be a greater glory to be a Receiver, than a Giver.———*And to give his life a ransom for many*:-So emphatically did he come *to serve*,—at whatever cost to himself. He came to make a sacrifice of himself *for the sake of men.* A *ransom* is *a price of deliverance*, (λύτρον from λύω). Jesus came to give himself as such. He looked upon men as captives. They had been transgressors, and therefore divine justice had to lay hold of them. They were "lawful captives." They were exposed to the full desert of their transgressions, and hence were in danger of "the wrath that is to come." What was to become of them? There were difficulties in the way of liberation pure and simple. Had they been liberated without any ransom, there would have been no security that they would care, for the future, to renounce "the way of transgressors." If all who transgress, were always liberated the moment they transgress, the sanctions of law would cease to be sanctions, except in name. The law would be no longer law, but mere opinion or advice. Thus a "ransom" was needed, if there was to be salvation,—needed for the sake of the transgressors, and for the sake of the law which they had transgressed. Jesus came "to give himself" as such a "ransom." He came, that is to say, to present to the divine justice what would afford a sufficient guarantee for the authority and honour of the law, in the event of the liberation of the guilty, and what would be fitted to have a wholesome moral influence upon the

46 [l] And they came to Jericho: and as he went [l] Mat. 20. 29. Luke 18. 35.
out of Jericho with his disciples and a great number
of people, blind Bartimæus, the son of Timæus, sat by the

---

hearts of the liberated.—*For many*:—The Saviour merely looks at the multitudinousness of the objects of his gracious intent. "The word *many*," says Calvin wisely, "is not put definitely for a fixed number, but for a large number; for "the Saviour contrasts himself with all others. And in this sense it is used "in Romans v, 15, where Paul does not speak of any part of men, but "embraces *the whole human race*." (*Harmony*, in loc.) The preposition translated *for* (ἀντί) does not mean, *for the benefit of*, or *in behalf of*. It properly means *over against*, and here represents the ransom as *an equivalent* for the persons for whom it was paid. *Substitution* is implied; *equivalence* is expressed.

Verses 46—52 constitute a paragraph that corresponds to Matt. xx, 29—34, and Luke xviii, 35—43.

Ver. 46. *And they come to Jericho*:—Or, more strictly, and as Tyndale gives it, *Hierico*,—the city of aromas, situated between the Jordan and Jerusalem. "Its palm-groves and balsam-gardens were given by Antony to Cleopatra. "From her Herod the Great bought them, made it one of his royal cities, and "adorned it with a new hippodrome, and many stately buildings; and here, too, "that Monster of iniquity died." (*Porter's Syria*, p. 184.) The modern representative of the ancient city is sadly degenerated. It is called *Riha*, or *Eriha*; and, says Dr. Porter, "a more filthy and miserable village could not be "found in all Palestine. Its few inhabitants, too, are not only poor, but "profligate, retaining some of the vices for which the cities of Sodom were ren-"dered notorious four thousand years ago." (*Ditto*, p. 185.)———*And as he was going out of Jericho*: The case about to be recorded seems to have begun as he entered into the city (see Luke xviii, 35); but it culminated, in all likelihood, as he departed. (See *Commentary on Matthew*, xx, 30).———*With his disciples, and a great number of people*: Literally, *and a sufficient crowd*, that is, *and a considerable crowd*, or, as Beza, in his last edition (1589), explains it, *no small crowd*.———*Blind Bartimæus, the son of Timæus, sat by the highway side, begging*: Or more literally, *Timæus's son, Bartimæus the blind, was sitting by the way side, begging*. There are, however, considerable minute variations of reading. Tischendorf and Tregelles read as follows,—*the son of Timæus, Bartimæus, a blind beggar, was sitting by the way side*. He had been, or he subsequently became, a somewhat noted individual. Hence the preservation of his name; though it is recorded by Mark alone. His father too would appear to have been noted for some reason or other. Perhaps they both became ultimately attached to the cause of the Saviour, and the fellowship of the disciples. (See verse 52.) The word *Bartimæus* just means in Aramaic, *Son of Timæus;* and hence it may seem strange to some that the evangelist should say "*the son of Timæus, Bartimæus*." There is no real redundancy, however. For the patronymic was used as the son's proper name. In Syria and the adjacent lands, ophthalmic affections were in ancient times, and are still in modern times, of very frequent occurrence. W. G. Palgrave, speaking of Arabia, says, "Ophthalmia is fearfully prevalent, especially among children,

highway side begging. 47 And when he heard that it was Jesus of Nazareth, he began to cry out, and say, Jesus, *thou* son of David, have mercy on me. 48 And many charged him that he should hold his peace: but he cried the more a great deal, *Thou* son of David, have mercy on me. 49 And Jesus stood still, and commanded him to be called. And they call the blind man, saying unto him, Be of good comfort, rise, he [m]calleth thee. 50 And he, casting away his

[m] John 11. 28.

---

"and goes on unchecked, in many or most instances, to its worst results. It "would be no exaggeration to say, that one adult out of every five has his eyes "more or less damaged by the consequences of this disease." (*Central and Eastern Arabia*, vol. ii, p. 34.)

VER. 47. *And when he heard that it was Jesus of Nazareth*:–Literally, *that it is Jesus of Nazareth*. The thing heard is reported in the direct form, and hence the introductory *that* is what is called *recitative* by critics,—*and when he heard*—(this to wit)—*It is Jesus of Nazareth.*———*He began to cry out, and say, Jesus, thou son of David, have mercy on me*:–Or, *Son of David, Jesus, pity me.*

VER. 48. *And many charged him that he should hold his peace*:–Literally, *chid him in order that he might be silent.* He seemed, by his vociferative appeals, to disturb the solemnity that was brooding over that part of the caravan-procession, in which our Saviour was moving.———*But he cried the more, a great deal, Son of David, pity me*:–He had faith in Jesus as not merely the Great Rabbi of Nazareth, but as also the Great Deliverer of Israel; and he was not to be thwarted in his application.

VER. 49. *And Jesus stood still*:–Or, more literally and simply, *stood.* He made a halt.———*And commanded him to be called*:–Or, as it stands in the manuscripts ℵBCLΔ, and in Tischendorf's and Tregelles's texts, *and said, Call him* (φωνήσατε αὐτόν). He said this to the persons who were near him.———*And they call the blind man, saying to him, Be of good comfort, rise, he calleth thee*:–Instead of *Be of good comfort*, it might be better to adopt the more literal rendering of Worsley, Newcome, Edgar Taylor, Norton, *Be of good courage* (θάρσει). If the expression *cheer up* were not so exceedingly colloquial, it would admirably represent the force of the original verb.

VER. 50. *But he, casting away his garment*:–Or rather, according to the analogy of the method in which our translators have rendered corresponding expressions, *but he cast away his garment*, or better still, *but he threw off his mantle*,—namely, the loose outer robe that was wrapped around him over his tunic. Newcome renders it *mantle.* Tyndale, the Geneva, Norton, Sharpe, use the word *cloak*,—the term that is employed in Matthew v, 40. The man was in haste, and wished to be disentangled from its folds.———*Rose, and came to Jesus*:–Instead of the simple word *rose* (ἀναστάς), the Sinaitic, Vatican, and Cambridge manuscripts (ℵBD) among others, along with the Old-Latin, Vulgate, Coptic, and Gothic versions, support a more graphic term, *sprang up*, or *sprang to his feet* (ἀναπηδήσας). Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, have received this term into the text. Griesbach reclaimed against

garment, rose, and came to Jesus. 51 And Jesus answered and said unto him, What wilt thou that I should do unto thee? The blind man said unto him, Lord, that I might receive my sight. 52 And Jesus said unto him, Go thy way; thy [n]faith hath [2]made thee whole. And immediately he received his sight, and followed Jesus in the way.

[n] Mat. 9. 22. Mark 5. 34.

Luke 7. 50. Luke 8. 48. [2] Or, *saved thee.*

its acceptance; and apparently with some reason, for it is difficult to suppose that if it had been the original term, it would ever have been deliberately pushed out.

VER. 51. *And Jesus answered and said to him, What dost thou wish that I should do to thee?*—This question the Saviour is said to have put by way of *answer*. It was the answer which he graciously gave to the original request of Bartimæus. *Pity me.*———*But the blind man said to him, Lord, that I might receive my sight*: Very literally, *that I might look up*. The *up* is not to be ignored. In the midst of his blindness, he would, in all likelihood, be sensitive, in some degree, to the light of the sun streaming down upon him from above. *Seeing* would therefore be naturally associated in his mind with *looking up*. The word translated *Lord*, is the term which Mary afterwards employed at the sepulchre on the resurrection-morning, *Rabboni*, or *Rabbouni*, (John xx, 16). It was equivalent to the term *Rabbi*, but more reverential. (See *Drusii Praeterita*, in loc.) It was akin to the French *Monseigneur*, as distinguished from *Monsieur*.

VER. 52. *But Jesus said to him, Go thy way, thy faith hath made thee whole*:—Not efficiently indeed, but instrumentally in a certain respect. His faith had laid hold of omnipotence; and omnipotence had made him whole. Very literally rendered, the expression is, *thy faith hath saved thee*. But our word *saved*, just as truly as our phrase, *hath made whole*, is not a precise reproduction of the idea of the original verb. Here the reference, we need not doubt, is, mainly at least, to the cure that had taken place in the man's body, so that he was now *sound and well*. (Compare Matt. ix, 21; Mark v, 23, 28; vi, 56; Luke viii, 36, 50; Acts iv, 9; xiv, 9. But it is not impossible, perhaps not unlikely, that the Saviour, with his deep view of the correspondencies of things outward and inward, employed the word with a two-edged reference. What was happening in the man's body was really—we may presume (verses 47, 48)—but the outward picture, or hieroglyph, of what had happened in his soul.———*And immediately he received his sight*:—He *looked up*.———*And followed Jesus in the way*:—*The way*, that is, *the route* that led to Jerusalem. Instead of the name *Jesus*, the pronoun *him* is found in all the most ancient manuscripts, inclusive of ℵABCD. It is, of course, the reading of the modern critical editors. Bartimæus joined the caravan, of which Jesus was the central object. He wished to attach his fortunes to "the son of David;" and he became, we may suppose, a devoted and well-known disciple. (See verse 46.)

## CHAPTER XI.

*Jesus approaches Jerusalem in a humbly triumphal way,* 1—10. *He enters the city, and the temple, and, after making a survey of the sacred places, goes out to Bethany,* 11. *Returning on the morrow, he passes sentence, parabolically, upon a barren fig-tree,* 12—14. *He enters the temple, and purifies it,* 15—17. *The scribes and high-priests take counsel against him,* 18. *In the evening he again returns to the country,* 19. *Next morning his disciples take note that the fig-tree was withered from the roots; and the Lord takes occasion to impress upon them the mighty moral power of faith,* 20—26. *On re-entering Jerusalem and the temple, he was encountered by the chief priests, scribes, and elders, who demanded of him, by what authority he did these things. He asked of them, on his part, a question regarding John the Baptist, which they wilfully refused to answer, so that he felt constrained to refuse to answer their question,* 27—33.

[a]AND when they came nigh to Jerusalem, unto Bethphage and Bethany, at the mount of Olives, he

[a] Mat. 21. 1. Luke 19. 29. John 12. 14.

---

## CHAPTER XI.

JERUSALEM is neared, and the tragic end of our Saviour's terrestrial career begins to loom into view.

VERSES 1—10 contain *the approach to the capital city by way of Bethany and Bethphage.* The paragraph corresponds to Matt. xxi, 1—11; Luke xix, 29—38; John xii, 12—15.

VER. 1. *And when they came nigh*:—Or, as it is in the original, *when they come nigh.* The reader is, as it were, carried along with the procession or caravan, and is present at the approach.——*To Jerusalem, to Bethphage and Bethany*:—A cumulative expression. Jerusalem is mentioned first, though it was remotest, for it was the Grand Terminus. Bethphage and Bethany were suburban villages, near to one another, and lying on the direct line of road that led to Jerusalem from the east. They were on the east side of the Mount of Olives, which was on the east side of the Holy City. Though the exact site of Bethphage is uncertain, yet it is probable that it lay westward of Bethany, and that it was thus a stage in advance toward the city. The evangelist, consequently, is to be regarded as enumerating the three places in their reverse topographical order, putting the last first, and the first last. Instead of the expression *to Bethphage and Bethany*, Lachmann and Tischendorf read *and to Bethany*,—the reading of the Cambridge manuscript (D), and, very decidedly and critically, of Origen in two distinct passages, as also of the Vulgate version, and of a preponderance of the Old-Latin codices. But it looks like a torso of an expression; and the Received Reading is overwhelmingly supported. (See

sendeth forth two of his disciples, 2 and saith unto them, Go your way into the village over against you: and as soon

in particular, Griesbach's *Commentarius Crit.* in loc.)—All trace, or almost all trace, of Bethphage has disappeared, though the place is often referred to in the Talmudic writings, in a puzzling way. (*Lightfoot's Chorographical Century*, ch. xxxvii.) As to Bethany, it has lingered on to the present day; but it is, as Tristram calls it, a "miserable village." (*The Land of Israel*, p. 199.) "Bethany," says Dr. Robinson, "is a poor village of some twenty families: its inhabitants are without thrift or industry." (*Researches*, vol. ii, p. 101.) And yet when the writer visited it in 1855, he found, among the children who were clustering about, a boy carrying *an inkhorn by his side*. On being asked if he could write, he answered in the affirmative, and wrote with his reed, on the blank leaf of our New Testament, the words, in Arabic, *God is Love*. It was of his own accord that he selected the words,—much to our gratification.——*At the Mount of Olives*:-*At* or *toward* (πρός). The preposition is attached, as by a longer thread of reference than the preposition in the two preceding clauses (εἰς), to the verb *come nigh*. The meaning is not that either Jerusalem itself, or the suburban Bethphage and Bethany, were *at* the Mount of Olives; it is that the caravan-procession, in approaching Jerusalem by way of Bethphage and Bethany, *moved in the direction of the Mount of Olives*. It is a little geographical remark, intended for such as were not familiar with the topography of the locality. It is introduced without any phraseological jointing, simply in the aggregative way. *The Mount of Olives*, or *the Mountain of the olive trees*, was the natural name of the beautiful mountain that rises close to Jerusalem on the east, the home or favourite habitat of the olive tree. "The sides of the mountain," says Dr. Robinson, "are still "sprinkled with olive trees, though not thickly, as was probably the case of "old." (*Researches*, vol i, p. 348.) "At present," says Horatio Hackett, "the mountain exhibits, on the whole, a desolate appearance. Rocky ridges "crop out here and there, above the surface, and give to the hill a broken "sterile aspect. Yet the mount is not wholly destitute of verdure even now. "A few spots are planted with grain; and fruit trees, as almonds, figs, pome-"granates, olives, are scattered up and down its sides. The olives take the "lead decidedly, and thus vindicate the propriety of the ancient name." (*Illustrations of Scripture*, p. 165.) The mountain rises about 220 feet above Mount Moriah over against it on the west, and affords a magnificent and most commanding view of Jerusalem and the surrounding country. "Surely," says Dr. Barclay, "there is not in all the world a prospect so delightful to behold, "as the panorama to be enjoyed by ascending the minaret alongside the Church "of Ascension, that now crowns the elevation nearest the city." (*City of the Great King*, p. 60.)———Ere the company had yet turned the apex of the mountain, the Saviour *sendeth forth two of his disciples*:-He *sendeth forth* (ἀποστέλλει), that is, *he details and despatches*.

VER. 2. *And says to them*:-Or, as we might now express it, *with the following instructions*.———*Go into the village over against you*:-Bethphage, most likely. Compare Matt. xx, 1, 2. Both Dr. Barclay (*City of the Great King*, p. 66), and Dr. Hanna (*The Passion Week*, p. 4), suppose that the village must have

as ye be entered into it, ye shall find a colt tied, whereon never man sat; loose him, and bring *him*. 3 And if any man say unto you, Why do ye this? say ye that the Lord

---

occupied a certain "tongue-shaped promontory or spur of Olivet," across the hollow which the road avoids, and just a few hundred paces before reaching the turning point of the mountain-ridge. There are on that spot tanks, and discernible foundations of buildings.———*And immediately on entering into it, ye shall find a colt tied*:-It might, according to circumstances, be the foal of a horse, or the foal of an ass. The circumstances and habits of the Jewish people in general, and, if more evidence were required, the special circumstances of the class of people with whom our Lord was accustomed to associate, made it certain that it was the humbler animal that was meant. It was no stigma, however, or diacritical mark of poverty, to ride upon an ass. The horse was for long reserved for war purposes; and, as among the Arians (*Lenormant's Ancient Hist. of the East*, vol. ii, p. 5), it was used for the war-chariot before it was used for riding on.———*Whereon never man sat*:-Or, according to the reading of Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, *on which no man has ever yet* (οὔπω) *sat*. In the action, which the Lord contemplated, he meant to be no man's successor. ———*Loose it, and bring (it)*:- Mark makes no reference to the mother-ass, beside which the colt would be found standing. (See Matt. xxi, 2.) It was the colt alone which was really to be used.

VER. 3. *And if any one should say to you, Why do ye this? say, The Lord hath need of it*:-The expression *the Lord* was, in itself, of somewhat indefinite reference, as there were then, as there are still, "lords many." There is no good reason for supposing that the disciples would be enjoined, or would be inclined, to point upward to heaven, as they spoke, so as to indicate *that "Jehovah" had need of the colt*. Such an assumption on the part of persons who had no instructions to present any special credentials of a divine commission, would not have been fitted to command the confidence and acquiescence of the owner. It is more natural to suppose that the intended reference was to our Saviour himself in his visible personality, although surrounded with no other insignia of lordship than his own native majesty and moral glory. He had arrived with his numerous 'following' two days before,—the day before the Sabbath which had just been ended. He had lodged in the immediate vicinity, either in Bethany, or, as is more probable, on one of the northern slopes of the mountain, on which the Galilean pilgrims were accustomed, year by year, to fix their temporary booths. (Compare *Robinson's Researches*, vol. i, 565, 566). He was the centre of an intense curiosity and enthusiasm. His fame had travelled before him. His appearance, though confoundingly humble, so far as paraphernalia were concerned, did not, in respect of a certain indescribable grandeur of bearing, belie his fame. His works were unprecedentedly marvellous. His words were, if possible, more marvellous still. His secret demeanour was without a speck on which doubt could fasten. Those who were nearest him, and saw most of him when he was ungirt, admired and revered him the most. Who could he be? What might he be? Everybody was putting such questions. His face had been set unflinchingly Jerusalem-ward. And the nearer his approach to the city of

hath need of him; and straightway he will send him hither.

---

the Great King, the more abstracted his gaze, as if he were looking into a future of infinities. Was it not possible,—was it not even probable,—that he was the long looked-for King of the Jews, coming to his people in disguise? Who could say what he would do, when once he should enter his capital, and be in the midst of the temple?—Such ideas as these might be, or would be, whirling about, in more or less of confusion, within many an expectant mind. Speculation would be rife. And throughout the whole village,—crowded as it was with strangers who were on their way to the Passover-solemnities,—there would be much eager inquiry and earnest discussion. Eyes would be frequently turned toward the spot, where our Lord and his disciples formed the centre of the widely distributed multitude, with which the whole mountain-side was alive. When messengers came forth from this centre, a kind of avenue would be made for them as they passed along from group to group; and it would be known, or telegraphed from individual to individual, that they were *the Great Rabbi's disciples*. When, consequently, they made their appearance in Bethphage, and when, looking perhaps in the direction of the surging central crowd whence they had emanated, they said, *the Lord hath need of it*, there would be no doubt remaining regarding the Personage referred to.——*And straightway he will send it hither*:—The Lord foresaw, as by a miracle of knowledge, every link,—however minute or complicated with human free-will,—in the future train of events. But, strange to say, there is a great difficulty regarding the expression. We do not refer to the fact, that instead of the future verb, *he will send*, there is in an immense preponderance of the uncial manuscripts, including all the oldest (ℵABCD), the present tense,—*he sends*. This, though something peculiar in such a statement, is capable of sufficient explanation. The present may, as often elsewhere, be idiomatically employed to express complete certainty of future occurrence,—such certainty as is warranted, when the event is seen in the very act of transpiring. We refer to the fact that in the Sinaitic, Vatican, Parisian, and Cambridge manuscripts (ℵBCD), as well as in LΔ, the adverb *again* (πάλιν) is found in connection with the verb *sends*,—*and immediately he sends it again hither*, that is, *and immediately he will return it hither*. The expression, in other words, is, according to these manuscripts, not to be regarded as informing the commissioned disciples that the colt, when claimed, would forthwith be sent by the owner. It is to be regarded as part of the commission which they were to discharge, embodying a promise that was to be made to such as it might concern, *that the Lord would without delay return the animal*. Origen, in two distinct passages of his *Commentary on Matthew* (iii, 722, 740), inserts this *again*, and interprets the expression as a promise of a speedy return. Schulz hesitated to reject the adverb, and Tischendorf and Tregelles have received it into their texts. We cannot think, however, that it is genuine. Internal congruity recoils. And it is a notable fact that no trace of the adverb is found in any of the ancient versions,—the Old-Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito-Syriac, the Philoxenian-Syriac, the Coptic, Sahidic, Æthiopic, Gothic, Armenian. Even Origen omits it in his *Commentary on John* (iv, 181). It must, we conclude, have been inserted in the margin of

4 And they went their way, and found the colt tied by the door without in a place where two ways met; and they loose him. 5 And certain of them that stood there said unto them, What do ye, loosing the colt? 6 And they said unto them even as Jesus had commanded: and they let them go. 7 And they brought the colt to Jesus, and cast

---

some very early copy of the Gospel, as an expository note, and thence have crept into the text of the ancient manuscripts in which it is found. It was, we doubt not, an inaccurate expository note.

VER. 4. *And they departed, and found the colt*:—It is simply *colt*, that is *a colt*, in the great body of the most ancient manuscripts. So too Griesbach, Scholz, Lachmann, Tregelles, Alford, and Tischendorf in his 1849 and 1859 editions. In his 8th edition, however, Tischendorf reinserts the article under the sanction of the manuscripts ℵCΔ. The sanction is not sufficient. ———*Tied by the door without*:—It had been led *to* (πρός) *the door outside*, and there tied. '*The*' *door*,—the Received reading and the right reading,—that is, *the door* of the dwelling-house that belonged to the proprietor of the animal. It is as if Mark were reporting from the lips of an eye-witness,—perhaps, as the ancients believed, and as Papias expressly asserts (*Eusebius's Eccles. Hist.* iii, 39), from the lips of Peter, who might, not unlikely, be one of the two disciples sent to fetch the colt. (*Comp.* Luke xxii, 8.) It is probable that the owner of the animal would belong to the "well-to-do" class in the village, and that hence his house would have a court, which would open out to the street by a great door. It is on the basis of this supposition that we see the propriety of the expression *outside*, that is, *outside the court*, instead of *inside*, where, in oriental houses of that description, it is common to have horses or asses standing, ready for use. ———*In a place where two ways met*:—This is rather, as Alexander remarks, a translation of the Vulgate version (*in bivio*) than of the Greek original, which strictly means *on the roundabout road* (ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀμφόδου). It is a topographical note that could only be given by an eye-witness. The likelihood is that the village would be straggled along a road that deviated from the highway, but came round to it again. ———*And they loose it*:—They engage in loosing it. He who was Lord of all had need of it.

VER. 5. *And certain of them that stood there*:—Most likely domestics of the proprietor, in the first instance. The imagination is left to fill up the minuter details of the incident. ———*Said to them, What do ye, loosing the colt?*—*What do ye?* an idiom corresponding to the German, *Was machet ihr?* or to the English, *What are ye about? What is that you are doing?*

VER. 6. *And they said to them even as Jesus had commanded*:—Or, more literally, *But they said to them as Jesus said.* ———*And they let them go*:—That is, the people ceased interference with them by hand or otherwise. *Let them go*:—The word is rendered *suffered* in chap. i, 34; v, 19; vii, 12; x, 14. It primarily means *sent away*. It is sometimes translated *forgave*—(that is, as it were, *forth-gave* or *gave up* what was due)—as in chap. ii, 5, 9, 10; iii, 28; iv, 12.

VER. 7. *And they brought the colt to Jesus*:—Or, as it is in the Sinaitic,

their garments on him; and he sat [b]upon him. [b] Zech. 9. 9.
8 [c]And many spread their garments in the way: [c] Mat. 21. 8.
and others cut down branches off the trees, and strawed *them* in the way. 9 And they that went before, and they

---

Vatican, and Ephraemi manuscripts (ℵBC), *they bring*. The past is 'présented' to us, or 'presentiated,' and thus 'présénted.'—*They*:–We are not, in our imagination, to draw a very precise line between the disciples and the surrounding crowd.———*And cast their garments on it*:–An extemporized housing, instead of the lofty oriental saddle. It was, however, quite seemly, as the *garments* referred to were the loose outer robes which were worn above the tunic. The word *cast* is equivocal in English, as regards tense. It was meant, however, to be past,—*threw*. But in the modern critical editions of the text, the verb is in the present, *throw*. The scene continues to be 'présented.' Such is the reading of ℵBCDLΔ, and of the Vulgate and Coptic Versions.———*And he sat upon it*:–He mounted, that he might enter the Holy City with all the significance of a triumph. He would not enter it, indeed, like a haughty warrior on his steed. He was the Prince of peace. Neither would he enter it in a bedazzlement of purple and pomp and pageantry. He was the Meek and Lowly One. And yet he was a Conqueror and a King; and the ideas that were incarnated in his career, and emblazoned in his final sufferings and death and resurrection, are destined to be triumphant all the world over.

Ver. 8. The procession began.———*And many*:–Catching the enthusiasm of the moment, and rising to the greatness of the occasion.———*Spread their garments*:–That is, *strewed their mantles* or *cloaks*,—in place of tapestry or webs of cloth.———*In the way*:–Literally, *into the way*. The attention is turned to the enthusiastic action of the people, in pressing in from either side, that they might succeed in bringing their garments *into* that precise line, along which the mounted monarch would pass, in the broad irregular highway.———*And others cut down branches off the trees, and strawed them in the way*:–Or, according to the briefer reading of Tischendorf and Tregelles, *and others branches, having cut (them) out of the fields*, (ἄλλοι δὲ στιβάδας—*small leafy branches*—κόψαντες ἐκ τῶν ἀγρῶν). The expression, *having cut them out of the fields*, is pregnant. The branches were cut "in" the fields, and then carried "out." Branches are natural decorations. No triumphal procession could well take place without them. At the conclusion of the great Franco-German War, in the course of which Napoleon III became a captive and was dethroned, the victorious German troops made their triumphal entry into Berlin, on 16th June, 1871, and it is written in the newspapers now lying before us (June 23, 1871), that "on each side of the way were placed gilt pedestals, and between each "pedestal hung a festoon of *laurel and fir*." "After the flags, come the "Guards. They are covered with *laurel and fir*." "The altars and cannons "are covered with *leaves and with branches of fir trees*."

Ver. 9. *And they who were going before, and they who were following*:–Namely, Him who was the Great Centre of attraction in the procession.———*Shouted, saying*:–This word *saying* is bracketed by Lachmann, and omitted by Tischendorf and Tregelles. It is omitted in the manuscrips ℵBCLΔ.———

that followed, cried, saying, [d] Hosanna; Blessed *is* [d] Psa. 118. 26.
he that cometh in the name of the Lord: 10 blessed *be*
the kingdom of our father David, that cometh in the name

---

*Hosanna*:—The sacred Hebrew *Hurrah*, literally meaning, *O save!* It would originally be used when captives, rebels, or submissive subjects, supplicated mercy from some conqueror or lord. But it had grown, in the course of ages, into a mere acclaim. The shouting people, in the case before us, were intentionally catching up and repeating the acclaim of Psalm cxviii, 25.——*Blessed is he*:—Or, *Blessed be he.* It should certainly either be *Blessed 'be' he*, or the corresponding expression in the following verse should be rendered *Blessed 'is' the kingdom.* In Tyndale the two expressions are rendered identically, and in both it is *be* that is employed,—the rendering of Mace, Wakefield, Principal Campbell, Norton, Edgar Taylor. Rightly so, and in harmony with the view of Luther, Piscator, Bengel, Zinzendorf, Heumann, Fritzsche. In the English version of Psalm cxviii, 26, the expression is, *Blessed be he.* It was not so much the intention of the enthusiastic multitude to make a doctrinal affirmation, as to express a devotional desire. They lifted up their hearts, actually or virtually, to God. *May God bless him! May God speak well of him!—God who "says" and "it is done."*——*Who cometh*:—*Who is coming,—who is the Coming One.* It is the expression of Psalm cxviii, 26, and beautifully represents the Messiah as *on his way.* All along the ages his advent had been imminent, for he was *on his way!* Time was on tiptoe; people were looking out; the ages were ages of expectancy; for *he was on his way! He would come, and would not tarry!* But now the shout would have a greater emphasis in it than ever. Were not the eyes of the people beholding him going along the way?—going to that Terminus, where it would be proper for him to withdraw his veil, and let his glory shine forth?——*In the name of the Lord*:—That is, *in Jehovah's name.* It is *Jehovah* that is the Hebrew word in Psalm cxviii, 26. The Messiah was not to come as a Principal, or as Supreme. He was *to be sent.* He was to be an "Apostle" (Heb. iii, 1) or Commissioner,—but of the highest possible dignity. He was to be *Jehovah's Lord High Lieutenant* or *Viceroy.* Hence he was to come in all the authority that could be communicated by the authorizing "name" of the Supreme.

VER. 10. *Blessed be the kingdom of our father David, that cometh in the name of the Lord*:—Or rather,—according to the reading of Griesbach, Lachmann, Scholz, Tischendorf, Tregelles, supported by the manuscripts ℵBCDLUΔ, 1, 69, and the best ancient versions,—*Blessed be the coming kingdom of our father David!* The enthusiasm of the people, having got vent for its first up-gushings in the fine old triumphal language of the 118th Psalm, extemporized for itself another channel in the common popular representation of the collective import of the prophecies. *The coming kingdom of our father David* was just, under a particular phase of expression, *the coming Messianic Kingdom, the coming kingdom of God, the coming kingdom of heaven.* It was called *the kingdom of David*, because it was regarded as at once the restoration, continuation, and antitypical culmination and completion, of that system of society that was established in the reign of David. The royalty was to continue in the line of king David, who was regarded as the Father not only of the Messiah in

of the Lord: Hosanna in the highest. 11 [e]And Jesus entered into Jerusalem, and into the temple: and when he had looked round about upon all things, and now the eventide was come, he went out unto Bethany with the twelve.

[e]Mat. 21. 12.

12 [f]And on the morrow, when they were come

[f]Mat. 21. 18.

---

particular, but of the Jewish people in general. The triumphal processionists, getting a glimpse of the glory of the lowly but lofty One, who was in the midst of them, felt persuaded that he was about to re-establish the kingdom of David. And so he was,—though on a far higher plane of things than was conceived of in their imaginations.———*Hosanna in the highest*:-That is, *Hosanna in the highest places,—in the heavens.* Norton totally misunderstood the expression. He renders it, *Hosanna, 'thou' in the highest heavens.* But it was no circuitous naming of Jehovah. It was a particular way of intensifying, to the utmost conceivable degree, the enthusiasm of their welcome. It corresponds, in a parallel line of things, to the appendage *for ever* connected with the *vive* or *viva* of other national acclaims. *Life* is intensified to the superlative degree in *life for ever;* and, correspondingly, the *salvation,* which is the kernel-idea of *Hosanna*, is intensified to its superlative degree in *salvation that is consummated in the highest heavens.* (See *Commentary on Matthew*, xxi, 9.)

VER. 11. *And he entered into Jerusalem*: Instead of *he entered*, it is, in the Received Text, *Jesus entered.* The word *Jesus* had been supplied, with most innocent intention, and, so far as the case before us is concerned, with most innocent effect. It is omitted in the modern critical editions, on the authority of the manuscripts ℵBCDLΔ, I, and the Vulgate version, &c.———*And into the temple*: The *and* is wanting in the modern critical editions. The entrance of our Lord *into the temple* is represented, not as something in addition to the entrance into Jerusalem, but as the continuative result of entering into Jerusalem. (Comp. verse 1.) He had *entered into Jerusalem,* because he purposed to *enter into the temple,*—his Father's House.———*And when he had looked round about upon all things*: Not simply as one might gaze, who had never been there before,—an arbitrary and wanton idea; but as one who had a right to inspect the condition of the place, and who was determined to assert and exercise that right. See verses 15—17.———*And now the eventide was come*: There is no *and*, either in the Received Text, or in the texts of the critical editors. The remainder of the expression would be more literally rendered thus,—*the hour being now late.*———*He went out to Bethany with the twelve*:-To *Bethany*, where he had some devoted adherents (John xi, 5), with whom he might choose to spend part of the evening. The night would probably be spent quietly and secludedly in the neighbourhood, where his disciples and himself might have their booths or tents. It was the custom of the Galileans and other strangers to camp out, at the time of "the great congregation," when the city overflowed.

VER. 12. *And on the morrow, when they had come from Bethany*:-Or, *after they came out from Bethany.* It was only then that what follows was realized. ———*He was hungry*:-Very literally, as Tyndale has it, *he hungered.* A certain proof, one should suppose, that he had not spent the night under the

from Bethany, he was hungry: 13 and seeing a fig tree afar off having leaves, he [g] came, if haply he might [h] find any thing thereon: and when he came to it,

[g] Luke 13. 6.
[h] Isai. 5. 2.

---

hospitable roof of Martha and Mary. He had most likely spent it in the open air, communing with his Father, and brooding over the condition of Jerusalem, the Jews, and mankind.

Ver. 13. *And having seen a fig tree afar off*:–Or, *from a distance.* "Mount Olivet," says Dean Stanley, "besides its abundance of olives, is still sprinkled with fig-trees." *(Sinai and Palestine,* p. 422.) In the very name Beth-*phage,* there is probably a reference to *figs.* Modern critics in general agree with Lightfoot that the word means, not, as Origen thought, *the house of jawbones,* but *the house of green figs.*———*Having leaves*:–A rather remarkable phenomenon at that early season of the year. If the Saviour was crucified on the 15th of the month Nisan, the day after the Passover-lamb was slain, then it is probable that he entered Jerusalem triumphantly on Sunday the 10th. It would, hence, be on Monday the 11th that *he saw the fig-tree from a distance, having leaves.* This 11th of the lunar month Nisan, would correspond to an early day in our solar month April,—a time when fig-trees in general would not be in leaf. But it sometimes happens that there is an exceptional precocity in a tree's foliation. There had been such precocity in the case before us.——— *He came, if haply*:–Coverdale supplies *to see* after the expression *he came.* So does the Cambridge manuscript (D). Our Translators, in using the word *haply,* left the lead of Tyndale and Coverdale, followed the Rheims version *(happily),* and thus returned to the translation of Wycliffe and the Vulgate *(forte).* The word so rendered however, (ἄρα), brings into view a different idea from that of *chance* on the one hand, or *good luck,* on the other. It has an illative force, and means, in such an instance as the present, *that being the case,* that is, *it being the case that the tree had leaves.*———*He might find anything*:–Literally, *he will find anything* (εὑρήσει). He came to the fig-tree to see, by actual inspection, if anything eatable was to be found. But the evangelist, instead of reporting historically the aim of our Saviour, carries us back in imagination to the scene, and sets us down, chronologically, beside our Lord, at the very time when he was approaching the tree. Hence he says, *if he will find,* instead of, *if he might find.*———*Thereon*:–Or more literally, *therein,* or *in it,*—within the umbrageous circumference of the tree.———*And when he came to it*:–Or, very literally, *upon it,* that is *close upon it,*—so *close to it,* as to be, as it were, *on it.*———*He found nothing except leaves*:–Was he then disapppointed? Had he "erred" in seeking for fruit? "If," says Augustin, "he "really sought for it, then he erred." *(Si vere quœsivit, erravit.—Serm.* lxxxix, 4.) The evangelical and reverential Witsius does not use the word "erred;" but he maintains *(haut illubenter)* that our Lord was "truly ignorant" *(revera ignorasse)* whether there would be any fruit on the tree, or not. *(Meletemata, X, De Ficu Maledicta,* §. 4.) Episcopius, too, held the theory of *true ignorance, (Responsio ad Quæstiones,* §. 9); and Calvin himself alleges that there is "nothing absúrd" in the idea. Wolf too adopts it, and puts it strongly thus,—"he abdicated, for the time, the use of his omniscience." Our Lord was acting, says Witsius, not as *God,* not even as *Mediator,* but simply as *a man,* who

he found [1]nothing but leaves; for the time of figs [1]Isai. 5. 7, Luke 13. 7.

"grew *in wisdom*," and therefore *in knowledge*. But, certainly, it was not simply as *a man* that he acted when he forthwith "answered and said, No man eat fruit of thee hereafter for ever;" and it seems to be sharp discrimination to find, in that judicial sentence, the mediatorial element, while the merely human element is recognized in the investigation that immediately preceded it. Augustin says that he only *feigned to seek for fruit, (finxit)*. His phrase is tantamount to that of Euthymius Zigabenus, *he simulated* (ὑπεκρίνατο). But he no sooner gives expression to the idea, than he finds that he has to confront the objection, *that 'feigning' or 'fiction' is, to all appearance, as inconsistent as 'erring' with perfection.* Hence he discriminates between legitimate or 'laudable,' and illegitimate or 'criminal,' *fiction*, and elaborately contends that the fiction in the case before us was laudable, because it was *figuratively significant*. (*Sermo* lxxxix, §§. 1—6.) He means that it was *a kind of figure of speech*. It was *a figure of action*. It was, as Cardinal Cajetan represents it, *a parable in act*. If there were any necessity for employing at all, in reference to such action, the word *fiction*, then it was not a fiction in morals, but a kind of literary fiction,—a symbolic or hieroglyphic representation of spiritual realities. Augustin was undoubtedly right in the substrate of his idea. Our Lord took occasion from the relation of his own physical hunger to a certain pleasant and nutritious fruit, to illustrate to his disciples some great spiritual verities, into the reaches of which it was of the utmost moment for them to get glimpses. See next clause, and next verse. See also *Commentary on Matthew*, xxi, 19.——*For the time of figs was not yet*:—Literally, *for it was not fig-season.* Very literally, *for it was not figs'-season.* The reading given in the texts of Tischendorf and Tregelles, (*ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς οὐκ ἦν σύκων*), is substantially of the same import, *for the season was not figs'-(season)*: and this, as the more rugged of the two, and supported by the Sinaitic, Vatican, and Parisian manuscripts (ℵBC*), as well as by LΔ, was probably the autographic form of the expression. It is an expression that has occasioned to expositors and critics—needlessly—an immensity of perplexity, issuing in a perfect forest of tangled controversial and conjectural literature. Schottgen gave up in despair the attempt to explain it. He honestly said,—"I cannot interpret it, or account for it; and I prefer to avow my ignorance, "than to make myself ridiculous by the proposal of ineptitudes," (*magis effutiendo.—Horae Hebraicae*, I, p. 171). De Wette says, "I find it absolutely unintelligible" (*ich finde ihn schlechthin unbegreiflich.* Handbuch, in loc.) Toup too despaired, and, measuring objective possibility by his own subjective inability, denounced the expression as an ignorant gloss, that had been, by some unhappy accident, foisted into the text. (*Emend. in Suidam*, P. ii, p. 219.) Wassenbergh ultimately acquiesced in this decision. (*De Glossis Nov. Test.* in loc.) Scholten also,—but looking at the whole subject from a very different standpoint,—speaks of the expression as "a senseless glossema." (*Het Oudste Evangelie*, p. 225.) Friedrich C. Baur does not impugn its genuineness, but he regards it as evidence of Mark's mental poverty (*Armuth*), and liability to misconception (*Missgriff*), whenever he let go the leadingstrings of Matthew! (*Marcusevang*, p. 90.) Michelsen, also, regards

was not *yet*. 14 And Jesus answered and said unto it,

---

the expression as senseless, but supposes, not only that it was absent from the text of the Proto-Markus, but also that, as it stood originally in the text of the Deutero-Markus, it was precisely the reverse of what it now is. He supposes that it stood thus, *for it was fig-season* (ἦν γὰρ ὁ καῖρος σύκων). It came to be transmuted into its present form, as he imagines, when "some one or other," with a little more sense than the evangelist, noticed that Passover-time was "not" the time of figs! (*Het Evang. van Markus*, pp. 22, 30.) It is a curious fact, when looked at in connection with this conjecture of Michelsen, that the "not" is wanting in the Anglo-Saxon version. The translator, apparently, had not been able to account for it, and therefore quietly left it out.

Rolof suggested, in his dissertation on the subject (*De Ficus Imprecatione*), whether we might not read the expression interrogatively,—*for was it not the season of figs?* Woolston proposed the same translation (*Miracles*, iv, p. 28). And Heinsius, having the same idea substantially as Rolof, suggested that we should alter the "breathing" of the negative particle (οὐ for οὐ), and by that means annihilate the negation. He would translate thus, *for where he was, it was the season of figs.* (*Exercitationes*, in loc.) It is an ingenious suggestion, and was approved of, at least to a qualified extent, by our illustrious countryman, Gataker, (*Marc. Antonin.* ix, 10). It was adopted too by Sir Norton Knatchbull; and le Cene introduced it into his French Translation of the Bible. And yet it is too ingenious by far, besides being geographically untenable. Passover-time was "not" the time of figs on Mount Olivet. Rilliet is totally mistaken when he says that "figs are ripe in Palestine about the middle of the month of March." They *never* are so. He antedates the earliest fig-season by at least a full quarter of a year. And yet the same mistake was unwittingly committed by Lambert Bos and Wolle, when they proposed to render the phrase, *for it was no (longer) the time of figs*, that is, *for the time of figs was past.* The "early-figs," or "boccôre,"—the earliest, the "precursors,"—were in June. The "summer-figs" were in August. The "winter-figs" survived the leaves.

What then are we to make of the evangelist's saying? Wakefield—working on the some basis of conception, as Heinsius, only leaving the text unaltered—advocates a transposition of reference, and, in his version, makes an actual transposition of clauses. He renders the verse thus,—"*And, seeing a fig-tree "at a distance with leaves on, he went, if he might chance to find some fruit upon "it; for the season of gathering figs was not yet come: but when he got up to it, "he found nothing but leaves.*" He supposes, apparently, that the evangelist is accounting for the reasonableness of searching the tree for figs, *inasmuch as they could not, at that season, have been all gathered off.* If the season of gathering figs had been past, it might have been unreasonable to have expected to find any. It would at all events have been unreasonable to have inferred, from the fact that none were found, that the tree was barren. Such is the representation of the case that Wetstein gives,—whose view is coincident with that of Wakefield. Iken also contends for the same interpretation, in his Dissertation on the subject, (*De Ficu ad imprecationem Serv. Exarescente*). Arch-

bishop Newcome likewise took the same view, and hence, in his *Revision of the Authorized Translation*, inserted in a parenthesis the words, "*but, when he came to it, he found nothing but leaves.*" The Unitarian "Improved Version" adopted this parenthesis; while Principal Campbell and Edgar Taylor transposed the clauses after the manner of Wakefield. So too, in substance, Bland, Holden, Lange. It is an ingenious shift of exegesis; but a real *shift* nevertheless, and quite unnatural,—more particularly if the phrase *fig-season* denote, as it evidently does, not specifically, *the time of gathering figs*, but generically, *the time when figs are ripe and ready for gathering*. (See Deyling's *Dissertation* on the phrase, iii, §. 29.)

What then? Has conjecture exhausted itself? Far from that. Bishop Hammond supposes that the expression means, "the year being unseasonable for that fruit." Le Clerc, in his French Testament, took the same view,—*for that season had not been favourable for figs*. So too Goesgen in his *Dissertation* on the subject (§. 44); and Hombergk, and Bornemann (*De Glossematis*, p. xlix). Most unnaturally, however, on both philological and exegetical grounds. Had the *fault* (so to speak) been in the season, the *blame* (so to speak) could not attach to the tree. Elsner saw this, and hence tried (*iuritâ Minervâ*) another shift. He supposed that the meaning must simply be, *for there was no crop of figs (on that tree)!* Alberti's shift, though not so utterly vapid as to the 'letter,' is still more objectionable as to the 'spirit,'—*for the figs were not yet ripe (on that tree)*. They would, however, he adds, be so by and by! (*Observationes*, in loc.) Triller's shift is unobjectionable in 'spirit,' but most objectionable as a matter of philology:—he thinks that the word *season* has no reference to time, but to the locality where the tree was, or, better still, to the constitution of the tree itself, *for there was no aptitude for figs in the tree*. (See his long note in *Bernard's edition of Thomas Magister*, pp. 489–491.) Hoogeveen's shift of punctuation is still more objectionable,—both as a matter of philology, and as a matter of natural history. He renders the passage thus, *he found nothing except leaves; nothing at all* (οὐ γάρ). *It was the time of figs*. (De Particulis, pp. 920—1.)

But what then are we to do with the vexed expression? We are manifestly just to take it as it stands, and to interpret it, without "vexation," according to its plain and obvious sense. Our Saviour found nothing but leaves on the tree, *because it was not the season for figs*. The remark is a good reason for the fact, *that he did not find figs to eat*. And it was of importance for the evangelist to make it, inasmuch as there is nothing in the preceding context to indicate to the reader, and more particularly to the Gentile reader, the particular time of the year when Jesus was visiting Jerusalem. But why, then, did our Lord punish (as it were) the tree, for not having figs, when it was not the season of figs? See next verse. And why did he "come" to it, to see "if, in accordance with the promise of its leaves, he might find anything thereon," when he must have known, as well at least as the evangelist, that it was not the time of figs? This leads us at once to the heart of the whole matter, and out of the reach of the whole difficulty. *Our Saviour was not expecting to find figs, in order to satisfy his bodily hunger*. His mind was bent on higher things. "He came to "the tree," says Zuingli, "not for the sake of eating, but for the sake of per-"forming an adumbrative action, (*sed aliquid praefigurandi causa*)." It was

[j] No man eat fruit of thee hereafter for ever. And his disciples heard *it*.

[j] Isa. 5. 6. Luke 13. 7. Mat. 13. 12.

---

true, "he was hungry." *His hunger, too, was the occasion that gave shape to his adumbrative action,—when he went to the leafy tree to see if there was fruit on it.* But in every step that he took toward the tree, and in every act that he performed after he reached it, as in all the details of his engagements, before and after, in those memorable Jerusalem-days, he was actuated by a far profounder "hunger" than that of the body. If this be ignored, the whole action of our Lord in the case before us, and the whole peculiarity and mystery of his life and death become an inexplicable enigma.

Grotius caught sight of the reality of the case, but over-did its exposition. He interprets the expression thus, -"*He hungered*: Namely, after the salvation of the Jewish people represented by the fig-tree." It is a true idea, and takes into account ninety-nine proportional parts of the whole reality of the transaction, while too many expositors have stuck on the remaining hundredth, and paltered with it. But it merges nevertheless out of view, unnecessarily and violently, the physical "occasioning cause" of the whole parabolic action. Even Theophylact,—galled as he was by the difficulties which beset his superficial view,—had insight sufficient to say, "But Jesus hungered for their salvation." And Cardinal Cajetan, with his keener eye, saw deeper, and with his masterly hand touched the case thus, "Jesus knew that it was not the time of figs; but he *came*,—composing a figure by the act of coming (*componens figuram actu veniendi*)." This hits the nail on the head, and rivets the correspondence of the outer and the inner. In this act of "coming," the Lord was engaged in composing and enunciating part of his parable. In the act of searching, after he had come, he was composing and enunciating another part. And then in the sentence which he passed, after careful judicial examination, he composed and enunciated another part still. The adumbration is complete. In the oral parable of *the barren fig-tree*, as preserved in Luke xiii, 6—9, there is something analogous. The proprietor of the vineyard "*came seeking fruit*." It is on a corresponding principle of graphic anthropopractic representation, that we read in Genesis, that when the cry of Sodom and Gomorrah was great, and their sin was very grievous, the Lord said, "*I will go down now and see whether they have done altogether according to the cry of it, which is come unto me; and if not, I will know.*" (Gen. xviii, 21.)

VER. 14. *And Jesus answered*:—Or, as the expression stands in the great majority of the best manuscripts, and in all the ancient versions, *and (he) answered*. Note the word *answered*. Petter says it is "an Hebraism:" but that explains nothing. The tree, as Bengel remarks, is regarded as having *refused to give fruit*. The people, whom the Saviour had in view as he spoke, had covered themselves, indeed, with the leaves of religious profession. They had been too forward in that respect. But, as regards "the fruit of righteousness," they were not merely wilfully backward; they were wilfully barren. Not only was there no fruit, fit for eating, there was no promise of such fruit. There were no young figs or 'grossi.' (See *Altmann's Obervationes*, ii, p. 445.) ———*And said unto it, No man eat fruit of thee*:—That is, *It is my pleasure that no one should eat fruit of thee*. Our Lord was thinking of the Jews as "a

15 [k] And they come to Jerusalem: and Jesus went into the temple, and [l] began to cast out them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the moneychangers, and the seats of them that sold doves;

[k] Mat. 21. 12.
[l] John 2. 14.

peculiar people," formed into a peculiar Messianic community, enjoying peculiar privileges, and lying under the obligation of a peculiar vocation. All this peculiarity was to "cease and determine." The world was no longer to be dependent on Jews, as Jews, for spiritual nourishment and enjoyment.——*Hereafter*:–Or more literally *any longer*, as the word is rendered in Acts xxv, 24. More literally still, according to the double negative in Greek, *no longer* (μηκέτι). And so it is rendered in 1 Thess. iii, 1, 5; 1 Tim. v, 23; 1 Pet. iv, 2. It is implied that the tree had been probably fruit-bearing in former times. The Jewish people *had been* useful in the world.——*For ever*: An excellent translation, though there is no reference to *eternity*, as we now understand that word. Tyndale's version is also excellent, though not quite literal either,—*whill the worlde standeth*. The phrase cannot be made intelligible by a very literal rendering, *to the age*.——"I hope," says the scoffing Woolston (iii, 8), "he asked leave beforehand of the proprietor." But there is not the shadow of evidence that the tree was private property.——*And his disciples heard*:–Or, *were hearing*. They were listening, in an attitude of attention, to what their Master said.

VER. 15. *And they come to Jerusalem: and Jesus went into the temple*: Instead of *Jesus went*, it is *(he) went* in the Vulgate, Coptic, Armenian, and Æthiopic versions, as also in the manuscripts ℵBCDLΔ, 1, and 33 "the queen of the cursives."——*And began to cast out*:–That is, *to drive out*, as the same word is rendered in John ii, 15. So too, the word is rendered here in Luther's translation, and in Bengel's, and Zinzendorf's.——*Them that sold and bought in the temple*:–Namely, lambs for the passover-supper, and oxen for specific sacrifices. A market for these animals was allowed, by the priests, in some of the ample spaces belonging to the court of the Gentiles. So thoroughly had the spirit of trade invaded the sphere of the spirit of devotion. It would have been well, indeed, to have had accommodation for the beasts, in the vicinity of the temple; but to take them inside, and to sell and buy and haggle there, was a climax of indecorum and irreverence.——*And overthrew the tables*: A fine exemplification of the primary import of the word *overthrew*. We should now say *overturned*,—only in *overthrew* there is the additional idea of violence implied. Wycliffe's translation is *turnyde upsodoun*.——*Of the money-changers*: Or, as the Rheims has it, *of the bankers*,–the money-traders, who, for a certain *agio* or *premium*, were ready to give Jewish money in exchange for the coins of the countries, from which the worshippers had come. The business of such traders was in itself most important. But it was shameful to erect their stalls in the very courts where devotional worship was to be performed.——*And the seats of those who sold doves*:–Or *pigeons*, for the accommodation of such as required to offer that kind of sacrifice, and of poor mothers and others, who could not afford costlier offerings. See Lev. v, 7; xii, 6—8; xiv, 22; xv, 14, 29; Numb. vi, 10.——Matthew, in *his* picture of our Lord's procedure at Jerusalem, gives the detail of the temple-purgation under the head of the first day's pro-

16 and would not suffer that any man should carry *any* vessel through the temple. 17 And he taught, saying unto them, Is it not [m]written, My house shall be called [1] of all nations the house of prayer? but ye have

[m] Isa. 56. 7.

[1] Or, *a house of prayer for all nations.*

---

ceedings. (Chap. xxi, 12.) We need not be surprised at this. There was neither in his case, nor in that of Mark, any scientific attempt to exhibit, in their *Memorials*, a precise chronology. But it is possible that the purgation may have extended over more days than one, for it is scarcely to be supposed that the traders would be so overawed as to make no attempt to re-establish their position. They would imagine, no doubt, that they had rights. They would have a licence, it may be presumed, obtained from the sacerdotal authorities, and most probably by purchase.

VER. 16. *And would not suffer*:—An admirable idiomatic translation. It is literally, *and did not suffer* or *permit.*———*That any one should carry any vessel through the temple*: It is simply *a vessel* in the original, and so it is rendered by Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, the Geneva, and the Rheims. Principal Campbell renders it idiomatically in the plural, *vessels*. Norton gives it freely *any article;* Mace, *any baggage*. The word, though strictly meaning a *vessel*, was used, by synecdoche, to denote all kinds of *utensils*. Our Lord would not allow that a mere convenience should be made of the temple as a thoroughfare of traffic. There would be no temptation, indeed, to use any other portion of it for this purpose, than the immense court of the Gentiles. It was so immense that tedious circuits would be avoided, in going from place to place, by passing through it. And then, *being only the court of the Gentiles*, it was not regarded by the supercilious Jews as entitled to that respect, which they acknowledged to be due to the other parts of the enclosure. But our Lord set his foot on all such disdainful distinctions, and the profane practices to which they led.

VER. 17. *And he taught, saying unto them*:—Or, as the phrase runs in the texts of Tregelles and Tischendorf (8th ed.),—*And he taught and said to them* (καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς). Our Lord gave reasons for his conduct,—reasons that were intended and fitted to instruct the people.———*Is it not written?*—Or as Luther gives it, *Stands it not written?*———*My house shall be called of all nations the house of prayer*:—A rather unhappy translation, so far as the expression "*of* all nations" is concerned, and at variance with the preceding English versions. Tyndale's runs thus, "My housse shall be called the housse of prayer *unto* all nacions." So Wycliffe, "*to* alle folkis;" and Coverdale, "*for* all people." The Geneva is the same as Tyndale's. It was Beza who led astray our translators. In all his editions, with the exception of the first (1556), he has "*by* all nations" *(ab)*, instead of *to* or *for*. Wrongly, as is manifest from the Old Testament passage referred to, Isaiah lvi, 7, and as is further evidenced by the fact that it was *the court of the Gentiles*, to which our Saviour refers as wantonly desecrated by the Jews. The expression *all nations* would be, more literally, *all the nations;* and, on the other hand, the expression rendered "*the* house of prayer" is anarthrous in the original, and is therefore more appropriately rendered "*a* house of prayer" by Coverdale, Mace, Wakefield, Prin-

made it a [n] den of thieves. 18 And the scribes and chief priests heard *it*, and sought how they might destroy him: for they feared him, because all the people was [o] astonished at his doctrine. 19 And when even was come, he went out of the city.

20 [p] And in the morning, as they passed by, they

[n] Jer. 7. 11.
[o] Mat. 7. 28. Mark 1. 22. Luke 4. 32.
[p] Mat. 21. 19.

---

cipal Campbell, Edgar Taylor, Norton, Young, Alford. So too by Luther, Bengel, and Zinzendorf.———*But ye have made it a den of thieves*:–Or rather, *of robbers* (λῃστῶν). See John x, 1, 8, in which *robbers* are expressly distinguished from *thieves* (κλέπται). Our Saviour intimates that a system of unblushing robbery, or fleecing, was carried on by the traders who transacted business in the court of the Gentiles. Exorbitant profits were extorted from the people who needed to purchase sacrifices or to obtain exchange of moneys. Coverdale, however, goes too far when, in imitation of Luther, he renders the phrase, *a denne of murthurers*. The word *den*, or rather *cave*, is evidence that our Lord was referring to *robbers* as distinguished from *thieves*. (See *Trench's Synonyms, sub voce.*) He thinks of *a cave in the mountains*, as the rendezvous and retreat of highwaymen. What a transformation for the temple! Instead of *a den*, Mace has *a harbour*.

Ver. 18. *And the scribes and chief priests*:–All the best authorities, both in the manuscripts and in the ancient versions, reverse the order of collocation, *the chief priests and the scribes*. The reference is to the leading men of the Sanhedrim.———*Heard (it)*: The reference is not simply or principally to what our Saviour had just said to the traders, but also to what he had done in driving them out.———*And sought*: This verb is in the imperfect tense (ἐζήτουν), and, as distinguished from the aorist of the preceding verb, it embodies an idea of incompleteness,—*and began to seek*.———*How they might destroy him* (ἀπολέσωσιν not ἀπολέσουσιν): It was a foregone conclusion that he must be destroyed; *but how to effect his destruction*,—that was the question. In the use of the word *destroy*, as distinguished from *kill* or *put to death*, there is a reference to our Lord as a Power, or living Energy in society.———*For they feared him*: The verb is in the imperfect tense,—*they stood in fear of him*. Their fear was the reason why, instead of laying hands on him at once, they planned and plotted, or *sought*, "how they might get rid of him."———*Because all the people*: Or, more literally, *For all the crowd*, namely, that was collected within the precincts of the temple. It would keep clustering around our Lord.———*Were astonished at his doctrine*:–Or rather, *at his teaching* (διδαχῇ). The word is not so much objective, *the thing taught*, as subjective, *the teaching*. See chap. i, 22, 27; iv, 2. Wycliffe has *teching*. It was the strange imperial power of the great speaker that amazed them. He spoke home to their hearts and consciences, and swayed them—they knew not why or how.

Ver. 19. *And when even was come*:–Literally, *And when it became late*. The gates of the city would be shut then, as now, at sunset.———*He went out of the city*:–To some spot or other on his favourite Mount of Olives, where there would be multitudes of pilgrims from Galilee and other places. See verse 11.

Verses 20—24 constitute a paragraph corresponding to Matthew xxi, 20—

saw the fig tree dried up from the roots. 21 And Peter calling to remembrance saith unto him, Master, behold, the fig tree which thou cursedst is withered away. 22 And Jesus answering saith unto them, [2]Have faith [q]in God. 23 For verily I say unto you, That [r]whoso-

[2] Or, *Have the faith of God.*

[q] John 14. 1.

[r] Mat. 17. 20. Luke 17. 6.

---

22. The chronology in Mark seems to be more explicit, and the narration less *conglomerate,* than in Matthew.

Ver. 20. *And while they were passing by in the morning*:—Namely, on their return to the city. Note the *they*. The Saviour is for the moment shaded off behind his disciples.———*They saw the fig-tree withered from the roots*:—Luther's version, adopted by Coverdale, is free, *to the root*. So Mace, *to the very roots*. But the pole of the evangelist's representation is better, for no doubt the blight would operate from within outward, and thus from below upward.

Ver. 21. *And Peter, calling to remembrance*:—Or simply, *recollecting*. The original participle, however, is passive. He was, on occasion of seeing the tree, *reminded*, viz. of the whole transaction of the previous day.———*Saith to him, Master*:—Or, as it is in the original, *Rabbi*, "the ordinary title of honour," says Petter, "which the disciples used to give unto our Saviour."———*Behold*:—The word is used absolutely, *Look!* or *Lo!*———*The fig-tree, which thou cursedst, is withered away*:—More literally, *has become withered* (ἐξήρανται). The *away* is superfluous, and inapposite too, inasmuch as the tree was too solid to have disappeared on withering, as might have been the case with a mere flower. The *away* is omitted in the Rheims, and is wanting in Wycliffe. It was introduced by Tyndale.—*Which thou cursedst*:—It is Peter's word, but not inappropriate,—though possibly he might not at the time have a fully-developed view of the Lord's action. The Lord *cursed*, not passionately, but judicially, and "in a figure."

Ver. 22. *And Jesus, answering, saith to them*:—He addresses not Peter only, but the whole circle, for they were all, no doubt, correspondingly affected and interested.———*Have faith in God*:—Very literally, *Have faith of God.* The genitive, however, represents the object, not the subject, of the faith, and hence the translation given in our Authorized Version is correct. The same construction occurs in Galatians ii, 16, 20, where we read of "the faith *of Jesus Christ*," and "the faith *of the Son of God*," —rather obscure expressions in English idiom. We can readily speak of "the love *of God*," meaning, according to circumstances, either the love *of which he is the subject*, or the love *of which he is the object*. But the phrase *the faith of God*, or *the faith of Christ*, has not got fixed, in its objective signification, into an easy-going idiom. Hence, Dr. Adam Clarke so entirely misunderstood the import, that he supposed the words *of God* to be a kind of oriental or Hebraistic adjective, equivalent to *great*,—"Have strong faith." When the Saviour says, *Have faith in God*, he means, *Have faith in the illimitable resources of God.*

Ver. 23. *For*:—This conjunction is omitted in the Sinaitic, Vatican, and Cambridge Manuscripts (ℵBD), and in the Vulgate, Peshito-Syriac, and Armenian versions, as in the great majority of the Old Latin codices. It is

ever shall say unto this mountain, Be thou removed, and be thou cast into the sea; and shall [s]not doubt in his heart, but shall believe that those things which he saith shall come to pass; [t]he shall have whatsoever he saith. 24 Therefore I say unto you, [u]What things

[s] James 1. 6.
[t] Mat. 7. 7. [u] Luke 11. 9. Luke 18. 1. John 14. 13. John 15. 7. John 16. 24.

---

dropped by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford. It is of little moment whether we decide to leave it out or to retain it. What follows is equally illustrative of what goes before, whether the illustrative particle be inserted or omitted. ———*Verily I say unto you*:–A favourite formula, with our Saviour, of solemn assurance.———*Whosoever should say to this mountain*:–Viz. this Mount of Olives on which we are standing.—*Whosoever should say*, or, *If any one should say.*———*Be thou removed*:–Or rather, *Be thou raised up*, viz. from thy foundations. The verb is frequently rendered, in the Gospels, *to take up*, as in Matt. ix, 6; xiv, 12, 20; xv, 37; xvi, 24; xvii, 27; Mark ii, 9, 11, 12; vi, 29, 43; viii, 8, 19, 20, 34; x, 21. It is rendered *to lift up* in Luke xvii, 13; John xi, 41; Acts iv, 24; Rev. x, 5.———*And thrown into the sea*:–A fine vivid idea, representing, in a bold hieroglyphic manner, a great result. The Saviour did not mean that it would ever be desirable that the Mount of Olives should be literally torn from its socket and hurled into the ocean. If, however, it were desirable, it would take place. But he meant that there would be occasion, within the moral area of human experience, for changes as great intrinsically, and every way as remarkable and difficult as the transference of mountains. "By the mountain," says Zuingli, "he understands whatsoever things are arduous."———*And should not doubt in his heart*: That is, *in his mind.* No amount of mere words, or vehement utterance of words, or loud profession, will be of any avail. The thing signified by pious words or pious profession must be present in the interior of the being. And that interior must not be distracted by an internecine contention of confidence and no-confidence, trust and distrust, in reference to the action of God. Utter moral impotence would be the result of such intestine distraction. There is really no room for legitimate doubt in reference to the desires which are the offspring of faith; and it is to *such desires only* that the Saviour refers. *All such desires are invariably fulfilled.* They cannot but be fulfilled; for they really root themselves in the desires of God Himself. ———*But should believe that those things which he saith*:–Or better, with Coverdale, *that 'the' things which he saith.* It is likely, however, that the autographic expression was singular (ὃ instead of ἃ),—*that what he saith*, or *that the thing which he saith.* This is the reading of the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts, as also of "the queen of the cursives" (33), and of Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford. ———*Shall come to pass*:–Literally, *comes to pass* (γίνεται). The present tense is employed to bring out the idea of absolute certainty. It is as if it had been said, *comes, as a matter of course, to pass.*———*He shall have whatsoever he saith.* Or more literally, *it shall be to him, whatsoever he should say.* But in the best manuscripts, including ℵBCDLΔ, the expression *whatsoever he should say* is omitted; and it is left out by Tischendorf and Tregelles. Its presence or absence is a matter of indifference, so far as exegesis is concerned.

Ver. 24. *Therefore*:–That is, since it is the case that *faith in God* efficaciously

soever ye desire, when ye pray, believe that ye receive *them*, and ye shall have *them*. 25 And when ye stand praying, [v] forgive, if ye have ought against any: that your Father also which is in heaven may forgive you [v] Mat. 6. 14. Col. 3. 13.

---

unites the believer to the omnipotence of the Almighty.———*I say to you, what things soever ye desire when ye pray*:–The word rendered *desire* properly means *ask* or *beg*, (αἰτεῖσθε).———*Believe that ye receive them* :–In the Cambridge manuscript, or *codex Bezæ* (D), the verb which represents the object of belief is in the future, *Believe that ye shall receive* (λήμψεσθαι). In the Alexandrine manuscript (A), on the other hand, and in many others, both uncial and cursive, the verb is in the present,—*ye receive* (λαμβάνετε), the reading of the Received Text, and therefore reproduced in our Authorized Version. It admirably represents the assurance which should characterize the disciples of our Lord. They should be as sure as if the blessing were already in the very act of coming into their hands. But in the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts (ℵB), as also in CLΔ, the verb is in the past, *ye received*. And this is the reading that has been received into the texts of Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford. Rightly: for it is a reading which would never have suggested itself as an emendation. It puts the Saviour's idea in the strongest possible form. His disciples were to be as assured *that they would receive*, as they would be *if they had received*. "It shall come to pass that *before they call, I will answer;* and while they are yet speaking, I will hear." (Isai. lxv, 24.) ———*And ye shall have them* :–Literally, *And they shall be to you*. God knows beforehand the prayers that are about to ascend, and sends on his answers in anticipation. A great promise; and available not to apostles merely, but to all believers. Compare Matt. vii, 7—11; 1 John iii, 22; v, 14, 15; James i, 4, 5; v, 15. *Every desire of the human heart, which is the progeny of faith in God, or faith in Christ, will be fulfilled*. (Psalm cxlv, 19.) It is in absolute coincidence with the desire of God's own heart. Should there be, interwarped or mingled with it, any atom of desire that is not in coincidence with the divine will, then the true believer, in the heart of his heart, desires that that desire should not be fulfilled. When his real prayer is stripped of all its unessential accessories, it is found that the presentation of that particular item is an excrescence, and forms no part at all of the essence of his petition.

Ver. 25. An essential condition of prevailing prayer, for any object whatsoever, is specified.———*And when ye stand praying* :–The common attitude assumed in prayer is here incidentally specified –*standing*.———*Forgive if ye have ought against any one* :–*Ought* or *aught*. (See on chap. vii, 12.) Wycliffe has *ony thing*; Tyndale, *eny thinge;* Coverdale, *ought*.—*Forgive* :–Absolutely and unconditionally? Yes, so far as private feeling is concerned, and as far as the well-being of society will permit. As there are limits, however, to the divine forgiveness itself, so there are corresponding limits to legitimate human forgiveness. Parents must sometimes punish;—not to gratify ignoble passion, but for the welfare of their children (Prov. xiii, 24), and for the maintenance of wholesome parental authority. Magistrates must sometimes punish;—not to gratify a spirit of personal revenge, but to guard the interests of the community. Private persons must sometimes prosecute and sue;—not

your trespasses. 26 [w]But if ye do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in heaven forgive your trespasses. [w] Mat. 6. 15. Mat. 18. 35.

27 And they come again to Jerusalem: [x]and as he was walking in the temple, there come to him the chief priests, and the scribes, and the elders, 28 and say [x] Mat. 21. 23. Luke 20. 1.

---

from a narrow spirit of malevolence, but from a spirit of broad benevolence. In all cases a forgiving spirit may be cherished, and will by Christ's disciples be felt and fostered.——*That*:–Or, *In order that.* The word brings into view one of the aims, which it will be legitimate for Christ's disciples to have in view when forgiving.——*Your Father also who is in heaven may forgive to you your trespasses*:–Note the *also*, i. e. *on His part, as you on yours.* In some circumstances the action of God is conditioned on the action of men; for, as Creator, Father, and Governor, he is not the Absolute One, but Relative. Comp. Psa. xviii, 25, 26; James iv, 8. It is legitimate for Christ's disciples to have in view their own forgiveness: but it would be altogether illegitimate and selfish to be either solely or supremely under the influence of that motive.

Ver. 26. *But if ye do not forgive, neither will your Father, who is in heaven, forgive your trespasses*: This verse is omitted altogether from the texts of Tischendorf and Tregelles; and it is condemned as "adulterate" by Fritzsche. These critics regard it as "freely" borrowed from Matt. vi, 15. It is noticeable that it is wanting in both the Sinaitic and the Vatican manuscript (ℵB), as well as in LSΔ, as also in some important manuscripts of the Coptic, Armenian, and Æthiopic versions. It is wanting too in Erasmus's editions of the text, and in his Latin translation. In the *Annotations* of his first edition he says that it is not in the Greek manuscripts. In the *Annotations* to the second and subsequent editions, he says that it is wanting in most Greek manuscripts, but present in some, and that therefore, and because the words are found in ancient authorities, *he has added them.* They *are not added however.* Luther too omitted them in all his editions of his Translation; and the omission continued for long after his death. It is a matter of no exegetical moment whether they be admitted or omitted. But the external evidence in favour of their admission is, if numerically considered, very preponderant; while, as regards the internal evidence, there is nothing to allege against their retention, that might not, with equal propriety, be urged against the counterpart statement in verse 25, which is of unquestionable genuineness. If the verse be genuine, it shows us that the Saviour readily diverged, in his discoursing, from the miracle of the blighting, to the still more practical, and in some respects more difficult, subject of personal forgiveness.

Verses 27—33,—a paragraph corresponding to Matt. xxi, 23—27, and Luke xx, 1—8.

Ver. 27. *And they come again to Jerusalem*:–*To*, or *into.*——*And as he is walking about in the temple, there come to him the chief priests, and the scribes, and the elders*:–Representatives of the Sanhedrim. There had probably been an extemporized meeting of the Council, or of its principal members, to consider what should be done. See verse 18.

Ver. 28. *And say unto him*: Or, as it is in ℵBCLΔ, 1, and in the Coptic,

unto him, By what authority doest thou these things? and who gave thee this authority to do these things? 29 And Jesus answered and said unto them, I will also ask of you one [3] question, and answer me, and I will tell you by what authority I do these things. 30 The baptism of John, was *it* from heaven, or of men? answer me. 31 And they

[3] Or, *thing.*

---

Gothic, and Æthiopic versions, *and they said to him.*———*By what authority*:–Literally, *in what authority.* Authority has a sphere *within which* it is operative. The *what* denotes *quality*, (ποίᾳ). The inquisitors wished to know the *quality* or *kind* of the authority under which our Lord acted.———*Doest thou these things?*–The reference is doubtless to the authoritative cleansing of the court of the Gentiles. See verses 15—17.———*And who gave thee this authority to do these things?*–Literally, *in order that thou mayest do these things*, (ἵνα). Instead of the conjunctive *and*, the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts have the disjunctive *or* (ἤ), which represents the second question as but another phase of the first. Tischendorf has accepted this *or*. But it is probable that it is a transcriber's emendation, simplifying the relationship of the two queries. It is a matter of option to run the queries into unity, or to keep them apart as representing two distinguishable, though affiliated, elements of the case. The kind or quality of authority may be discriminated from its source. It might, for instance, be merely that of a Rabbinical Reformer, or that of a divinely commissioned Messiah.

Ver. 29. *But Jesus answered and said to them, I will also ask you*:–Or, more literally, and as the Rheims has it, *I also will ask you*, i.e., *I, on my part.* The *also*, however, along with the pronoun, (κἀγώ), is omitted in the Vatican manuscript, and a few other authorities; and it is hence left out by Tischendorf and Tregelles. On insufficient grounds.———*One question*:–A free, but excellent translation. It is *one word* in the original, (ἕνα λόγον); and such is the Rheims translation, and Wycliffe's—"o word." Coverdale has "a word;" Tyndale, "a certayne thinge," which is partially reproduced in the margin of our Authorized Translation.———*And answer me, and I will tell you by what authority I do these things*:–It is again '*in*' *what authority*, in the original. See verse 28. The Saviour, though eminently "meek and lowly," yet stood erect, in the presence of his inquisitors, on a pedestal of dignity.

Ver. 30. The question was as follows,—*The baptism of John, was it from heaven, or from men?* Was it a truly divine, or a merely human ordinance? Did it bear the impress of the divine will, or merely of a human assumption? It was a crucial question to the priests, scribes, and elders, and was eminently fitted to determine whether they were qualified, in their present mood, to understand the ground, or reason and reasonableness, of our Lord's procedure. See next verse. The "baptism" of John is specified representatively, in consequence of its conspicuousness in his ministry. But the idea, as Zuingli correctly remarks, is, *The mission of John, was it divine, or merely self-assumed and human?* ———*Answer me*:–He would give them leisure for deliberation; but he insisted on a determinate answer. As he spoke, they would feel the presence of an indescribable authority and majesty.

Ver. 31. *And they reasoned with themselves*:–That is, *among themselves*, turn-

reasoned with themselves, saying, If we shall say, From heaven; he will say, Why then did ye not believe him? 32 But if we shall say, Of men; they feared the people: for [a]all *men* counted John, that he was a prophet [a]Mat. 14. 5.
indeed. 33 And they answered and said unto Jesus, We

---

ing to one another. Tyndale's version is, *they thought in themselves*, but the preposition employed (*πρός*) naturally suggests the idea of conference.———*Saying, If we should say, From heaven; he will say, Why then did ye not believe him?* It is noteworthy that in reasoning with one another, it was not their aim to get such an answer to our Lord's query as would embody the truth, or even their own conviction in reference to the truth. They simply, on a plane of low expediency,—considered what would serve their purpose as inquisitors. They therefore came to the conclusion that it would be inexpedient to say that John's baptism was from heaven. They dreaded that, if they should make such an answer, they would expose themselves to the retort that they had paid no heed to his message, either as it regarded themselves, or as it regarded the Messiah. John had not been welcomed by them as a herald of divine news. He had been to them, on the contrary, as a thorn in their side.

VER. 32. *But if we should say*:—The *if* here is wanting in almost all the great manuscriptural authorities, and is hence omitted not only by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, but also by Bengel, Matthæi, Knapp, Scholz. It was disapproved of by Mill (§. 1344), and suspected by Griesbach; and it was omitted from the Complutensian edition, and the two 'O mirificam' editions of Robert Stephens. The sense of the clause is not affected by the omission. The translation will then simply be, *But should we say.*———*From men*:—The evangelist leaves us to supply what, in the estimation of the inquisitors, would be the result of such an answer. The inquisitors themselves deemed it prudent to be silent. Hence they would, by shrug of shoulder, or by finger on mouth, or by some other movement, indicate *aposiopesis*. In some editions a point of interrogation is put after the alternative,—*But should we say, Of men?* This point is given by Robert Stephens in his second 'O mirificam' edition, that of 1549, and it has been adopted, not only by Bengel, but also by Lachmann and Tischendorf. It is approved of too by Meyer. It is just another and earlier form of representing the hypothetical or deliberative nature of the expression. But it is not needed in English, Greek, or German.———*They feared the people*: We are left to extract from this historical expression the idea which was in their minds, but which they would not like to bring out to one another in explicit words—*we fear the people*, (Matt. xxi, 26).———*For all (men)*: This word *men* is an unhappy supplement. Luther and Coverdale more felicitously turn the expression thus, *for they all*, that is, *for all the people*. But there is no need for supplementing either *men* or *they*. The Rheims has simply *for al.*———*Counted John, that he was a prophet indeed*:—It is a rather rugged expression, but it represents a real ruggedness in the original, *held John indeed that he was a prophet*, that is, *held John to be indeed a prophet*,—a man inspired by God, to make known divine ideas. (See chapter vii, 6.)

VER. 33. *And they answered and say to Jesus, We cannot tell*:—Literally, *We know not*, or, as Wycliffe has it, *we witen nevere*. It was an unconscientious

cannot tell. And Jesus answering saith unto them, Neither do I tell you by what authority I do these things.

## CHAPTER XII.

*Jesus depicts, in the parable of the vineyard, the unfaithful conduct of the priests, scribes, and elders,* 1—9. *He represents himself as the Stone which the builders despised, but which became head of a corner,* 10, 11. *The priests, scribes, and elders wished to seize him then and there, but feared the people,* 12. *Pharisees and Herodians then tried to entrap him, by asking, "Is it lawful to give tribute to Cæsar, or not?" But Jesus eluded their snare with consummate dexterity and wisdom,* 13—17. *Sadducees then encountered him on the subject of the resurrection; but they too were confounded by argumentation that was at once original and irresistible,* 18—27. *A scribe, struck by the power of his reasoning, inquired of him, "Which is the first commandment of all?" and his answer elicited the inquirer's entire approbation,* 28—33. *Jesus commended him,* 34. *And then he put, on his part, a question in reference to the teaching of the scribes concerning the Messianic Son of David,* 35—37. *He warned the people to beware of the scribes in*

---

answer,—their real idea being, if they had only possessed sufficient manliness to have uttered it,—*We think it inexpedient to say.*———*And Jesus answering, saith to them*:—The word *answering* is omitted in the Sinaitic, Vatican, and several other uncial manuscripts, and in "the queen of the cursives," as also in the Peshito-Syriac, Coptic, Sahidic, and Armenian versions. It is left out by Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford.———*Neither do I tell you by what authority I do these things*:—Our Lord acted on a principle at once of equity and of dignity. Since they dealt unconscientiously in reference to John's testimony, he was justified in retributively withholding from them, in present circumstances, his own testimony. It became too his superior position. For he was above them, even as John was,—only to a much higher degree. If they had been conscientiously seeking or wishing to ascertain his true position and authority, they had his works to enlighten them; and he would have rejoiced to have added such words as might have been of still farther service.

## CHAPTER XII.

There is no winding up of a distinct department of narrative at the conclusion of the preceding Chapter. The break into a new Chapter is topical only, as a matter of convenience in lection and reference.

Verses 1—12 constitute a paragraph, which is parallel to Matt. xxi, 33—46, and Luke xx, 9—19.

*general*, 38—40. *He commended the poor widow, who threw into the treasury of the temple two mites, "all her living,"* 41—44.

AND he began to speak unto them by parables. [a]A *certain* man planted a vineyard, [b]and set an hedge about *it*, and digged *a place for* the wine-

[a] Mat. 21. 33. Luke 20. 9.
[b] Isai. 5. 2.

VER. 1. *And he began to speak to them by parables*:—*To them*, that is to the inquisitorial representatives of the Sanhedrim, who had asked him to produce his credentials for interfering in the affairs of the temple. See Matt. xxi, 28. There would, however, be an immense concourse of people clustering about, who would in part overawe the deputies of the Council, and constitute at the same time the great body of our Lord's auditors. See Luke xx, 9. *By parables*:—Or more literally, *in parables*, or, as it is in Tyndale's version, *in similitudes*. Such too is the import of Luther's translation of the word, *(Gleichnisse)*. See on the radical import of the term, Chap. iii, 23.———*A (certain) man*: Or, with Wycliffe and Luther, we may omit the supplementary *certain*.———*Planted a vineyard*:—Our Lord draws, as was his wont, his illustration from common life and familiar objects. Palestine was emphatically a vine-growing country, and fitted, in consequence of its peculiar configuration and climate, for rearing the very finest grapes.———*And set an hedge about it*:—Or, *And surrounded it with a fence;* it might be *a wall* (Prov. xxiv, 31); it might be *a quick-set hedge* (Prov. xv. 19.); or it might be a combination of both (Isai. v, 5). "In addition," says Horatio B. Hackett, "to a stone wall, or "as a substitute for it, the Eastern vineyards have often a hedge of thorns "around them. A common plant for this purpose is the prickly pear, a "species of cactus, which grows several feet high, and as thick as a man's "body, armed with sharp thorns, and thus forming an almost impervious "defence." *(Illustrations*, p. 109). This cactus-hedge is much used about Joppa for instance; but still it is, of itself, no sufficient defence against jackals, and some other wild animals, which abound in Palestine, and infest the vineyards about the vintage season.———*And digged (a place for) the wine-fat*: There is no need for the supplementary expression *a place for*. The *wine-fat*, or *wine-vat*, itself was not *digged* indeed, in the sense of being delved out of the soil; and hence Wycliffe's translation *and dalf a lake* is not appropriate. But it was *digged* in the sense of being *scooped* or *hewn* out of the rock. See Isai. v, 2 *(margin)*. Tyndale's translation is peculiar, *and ordeyned a wyne-presse*, that is, *and set in order a wine-press*.—Multitudes of the wine-vats referred to are still to be found in the vicinity of Palestine. And from them we learn that, a sloping rock being selected, a trough was hollowed out, two or three feet perhaps in depth, and four or five, or more or less according to circumstances, in length and breadth. This was the *wine-press* proper. Then immediately below in the same slope, another trough,—or lake *(lacus)*, as the Romans called it,—of smaller dimensions, was cut out, with an aperture, or apertures, communicating with the compartment above. Into this the juice of the grapes ran, when they were trodden in the press. Thence it would be taken out and put into large bottles or skins. The word that is

fat, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and went

used in the passage before us (ὑπολήνιον), though freely used to designate the whole complex excavation, properly denotes this lower trough or lake. (See *Bruinier de Verbis compositis*, p. 170.) The word used by Matthew (xxi, 33, ληνός) brings prominently into view the upper compartment, — the *press* or *torcular*. Compare Rev. xiv, 19, 20; xix, 15. The translation of the Geneva of 1557 is exceedingly periphrastic, *and digged a pit to receave the lycour of the wynepresse.*——*And built a tower*:—That is, a watch-tower, which, however, would also serve as a residence during the vintage-season. "Watch-towers," says Horatio B. Hackett, "are confined chiefly to vineyards "and orchards."—"They caught my attention first as I was approaching Beth-"lehem, from the south-east. They appeared in almost every field within sight "from that direction. They were circular in shape, fifteen or twenty feet high, "and, being built of stones, looked, at a distance, like a little forest of obelisks. "I was perplexed for some time to decide what they were. My travelling "companions were equally at fault. Suddenly, in a lucky moment, the words "crossed my mind,—*a certain man planted a vineyard, and set an hedge about "it, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and went into a far country.* "(Mark xii, 1.) This recollection cleared up the mystery. There before my "eyes stood the towers, of which I had so often read, and thought."—"Those "which I examined had a small door near the ground, and a level space on the "top, where a man could sit and command a view of the plantation. I after-"wards saw a great many of these structures near Hebron, where the vine "still flourishes in its ancient home." (*Illustrations*, p. 103.) Dr. W. M. Thomson had experience of the watchfulness of the watchmen on these towers. Passing on a certain occasion through the vineyards of Lebanon, "I was," says he, "suddenly startled by a long loud note of warning, swelling up the steep cliffs "of the mountains, and responded to by others before and behind, ringing to-"gether in concert, and waking the echoes that sleep in the wadies and among "the rugged rocks. Then one of the watchmen, leaving his lofty station, "descended to meet me with hands laden with the best clusters for my "acceptance, and this too without money and without price. Courteously "accompanying me to the end of the vineyards, he then dismissed me with a "graceful bow, and the prayer of *peace* on his lips. If, however, one attempts "to take without permission, these watchmen are required to resist even until "death, and, in the execution of their office, they are extremely bold and "resolute." (*The Land and the Book*, p. 599.)——*And let it out to husband-men*:—Literally, *and gave it out*, viz. in his own interest; (such is the force of *the middle voice*). A company of practical vine-dressers became the lessees of the vineyard. Tyndale renders the expression, *let yt out to hyre with husbandmen*. The word rendered *husbandmen* (γεωργοῖς) properly means *earth-workers, tillers*, or, as Wycliffe has it, *tilieris*. The English word *husbandman* had originally a higher meaning, denoting *a man who was the centre and head of a household establishment.*——*And went into a far country*:—There is nothing in the original (καὶ ἀπεδήμησεν) to vindicate the insertion of the word *far*, at least in its modern acceptation. The idea simply is, *and went from his own people*, that is, *and went abroad*. The translation of Tyndale, Coverdale,

into a far country. 2 And at the season he sent to the husbandmen a servant, that he might receive from the husbandmen of the [c]fruit of the vineyard. 3 And they [c] Luke 13. 6.
caught *him*, and beat him, and sent *him* away empty. 4 And again he sent unto them another servant; and at him they

---

the Geneva, and the Rheims, is, *and went into a straunge countre.* He went *forth* or *forth* from his native land,—a common enough practice in our Lord's days, when travelling was general, and Rome was a great centre of attraction for the wealthy in all surrounding lands. For the application of the parable see on verse 9.

VER. 2. *And at the season*:—The vintage time.———*He sent off to the husbandmen a servant*: Instead of *the husbandmen* Tyndale has it, freely, *the tenauntes.* ———*That he might receive from the husbandmen of the fruit of the vineyard*:—*Of the fruit*, literally *from the fruits.* A partitive expression. The rent was to be paid in kind, the servant or commissioner being, no doubt, instructed by his lord to commute the fruits received into money, by means of some of the traders in the adjoining city.

VER. 3. *And they caught him*:—Or more literally, *and they took him.* They caught hold of him.———*And beat him*:—Or, as the Rheims has it, *bette him.* Tyndale and Coverdale have *bet.* They cudgelled him. Literally, *they flayed him.*———*And sent him away empty*:—They dismissed him with nothing in his hands.

VER. 4. *And again he sent off to them another servant*:—Perhaps of a higher position, or of a more commanding nature.———*And at him they cast stones*:—There is some doubt regarding the genuineness of this clause. It is wanting in the Sinaitic, Vatican, and Cambridge manuscripts (ℵBD), as well as in LΔ, 1, and 33 "queen of the cursives." It is wanting too in the Italic, Vulgate, Coptic, Sahidic, and Armenian versions. Griesbach suspected it (*Com. Criticus*). Mill condemned it (*Prol.* p. xliii). Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles omit it. Rightly, most likely. It would be introduced, at first into the margin, to explain what follows, or as an import from Matt. xxi, 35.———Omitting the word translated *they cast stones*, the clause will run thus, *and him they wounded-in-the-head*:—The word employed occurs nowhere else in the form in which it is found in the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts (ℵB), and L, (ἐκεφαλίωσαν). They '*headed*' *him*, that is, apparently, they '*broke his head*,' as Tyndale and Coverdale have it. *They inflicted severe and dangerous wounds upon his head.* The word is, in the other manuscripts, spelled differently (ἐκεφαλαίωσαν), and is a common enough term, but never occurring in the sense which,—if it be the true reading,—it must bear in the passage before us. It everywhere else means *to reduce to a head or heads, to sum up.* Wakefield ingeniously supposes that here the meaning is, *They dealt with him summarily.* But such a use of the verb, with a person for the object of its action, is unexampled and unlikely. It is probable that the evangelist's word had been a term that was common, in the acceptation accorded to it, in certain circles of provincial society, though it had never got the sanction of any classical writer. (See *Lobeck's Phrynichus*, p. 95.) ———*And sent him away shamefully handled*:—Or, as the clause stands, more briefly and abruptly, in ℵBDL, and "the queen of the cursives," *and shame-*

[d] cast stones, and wounded *him* in the head, and sent *him* away shamefully handled. 5 And again he sent another; and him they [e]killed: and [f]many others, beating some, and killing some. 6 Having yet therefore one son, his [g]well-beloved, he [h]sent him also last unto them,

[d] Heb. 11. 37.
[e] Mat. 23. 37. [f] Neh. 9. 30. Jer. 7. 25.
[g] Mark 1. 11.
[h] John 3. 16. 1 John 4. 10.

---

*fully-handled* (καὶ ἠτίμασαν),—*and him they wounded in the head, and shamefully handled.* This abbreviated reading is supported by the Italic, Vulgate, Sahidic, and Coptic versions.—*Shamefully handled*:—Or *dishonoured*, or, as Tyndale has it, *all to revyled*, that is *altogether reviled.* It is the generic summing up of all that the imagination naturally suggests when we think of what must have been done to the man, in the affray in which his head was seriously wounded.

Ver. 5. *And again he sent off another*:—His forbearance was something remarkable. The *again* is wanting in the highest manuscriptural authorities, ℵBCDLΔ, 33, and is left out by Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles. ———*And him they killed*:—Him they killed *outright.*———*And many others, beating some, and killing some*:—An incomplete expression, but easily understood. There should not be, as is common in the modern editions of the English Bible, a mere comma after the preceding clause, *and him they killed*, and then a semicolon after the expression *and many others*,—thus detaching to a distance the subsequent clauses. The result of this punctuation is, that the mind is led to carry forward the word *killed* to the expression *and many others.* That, however, is not the idea of the original. The clause, *and him they killed*, is self-contained and complete, with its pronoun preceding its verb, as in the two foregoing clauses. But when it is added *and many others*, the mind of the writer, or speaker, instead of looking backward, in the direction of the verb of the preceding clause, looks forward, in quest, as it were, of some more comprehensive verb that would embrace in its import, not only actual murder, but also such other violent and shameful treatment as might stop short of murder. Instead, however, of laying hold of such a verb, the mind assumes it, and then proceeds to trace out derivatively the two courses of conduct pursued,—*cudgelling some, and killing others outright.* The punctuation of Blayney's "*Standard Edition*" of the English Bible, published in 1769, is wrong, having the now-current comma after *killed*, and the semicolon after *others.* But in the *editio princeps* of 1611, as also in the Second Issue of that year, and in the four succeeding folio editions of 1613, 1617, 1634, and 1640, as in almost all the other editions, larger or smaller, for many years, the punctuation is correct,—a colon after *killed*, and only a comma after *others.* Tyndale's punctuation is the same, and so is that of the Rheims. So was that of Beza, in all his editions, as also of Bengel in all his, Greek and German. It was the punctuation, too, of Robert Stephens in his last edition,—that of 1551. It is reproduced in the Elzevir, and in Mill.

Ver. 6. *Having yet therefore one son, his well-beloved*:—It is very touchingly put, especially in the original,—although there is some difficulty in determining the autographic form of some of the minute details of phraseology. The *therefore* for instance is dropped out of the text by Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford.

saying, They will reverence my son. 7 But these husbandmen said among themselves, This is the heir; come, let us kill him, and the inheritance shall be our's. 8 And they took him, and killed *him*, and cast *him* out of

*i* Heb. 1. 2.
*j* Acts 2. 23. Acts 3. 15.
*k* Heb. 13. 12.

---

It is omitted in ℵBLΔ, 1, 33, and in the Coptic, Armenian, and Æthiopic versions. But tinkeringly, no doubt. It seems to embarrass the connection; and certainly it would never have been inventively thrust in, if it had been originally wanting. It is easy to account for its omission, but difficult to conjecture a reason for its intrusion. And yet in such a style as Mark's, it is interestingly significant. It recalls attention to the fact that all the messengers hitherto sent had failed to have effect upon the lessees. The lord of the vineyard *therefore* thought of a superior kind of messenger.—*Having yet therefore one son*:—Instead of *having* (ἔχων), Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford read *he had* (εἶχεν) on the authority of ℵBCLΔ, 33. It is the reading, too, of the Philoxenian-Syriac, and is supported by the Peshito-Syriac. We are disposed to look upon it as genuine. Its artificiality is obvious. It does not naturally coalesce with *therefore*. The participial reading smoothes the expression, and would not, one should imagine, have ever been altered, had it been original. But the artless evangelist, though evidently meaning what is expressed by the participial reading, sets down his thoughts, with less nicety of interdependency, in a semi-detached way,—*he had yet therefore one son, his well-beloved*, or, more literally, suggestively, and touchingly, *he had therefore yet one, a beloved son*. He had *one* individual more, whom he could send with some prospect of success, *a beloved son*. The *his* of the Received Text is supplemented. It is wanting in ℵBCDLΔ, and in the Vulgate, Syriac-Peshito, Coptic, Sahidic, and Armenian versions. It is evidently spurious. The word, again, rendered *well-beloved* in our Authorized Version, (ἀγαπητόν), just means *beloved*, and is generally so rendered in other portions of our Authorized Version. See Matt. iii, 17; xii, 18; xvii, 5; Mark i, 11; ix, 7; 1 John iii, 2, 21; iv, 1, 7, 11, &c. Preceding translators, however, had, in the case before us, set the example of intensifying its import. Wycliffe renders it, *most dereworth*. The Geneva has *dere beloved*. The Rheims, *most deere*. Tyndale, *whom he loved tenderly*.——*He sent him off last to them, saying, They will reverence my son*:—Very literally, *they will turn-themselves-in-upon-themselves* (ἐντραπήσονται) *in relation to my son*. When erring or unworthy people thus turn-themselves-in-upon-themselves, they naturally feel *ashamed* of themselves (see 1 Cor. iv, 14; 2 Thess. iii, 14; Tit. ii, 8), and are hence humiliated, and *reverent*.

VER. 7. *But those husbandmen*:—Very literally, *But they, the husbandmen*, or, as Wycliffe has it, *the tenauntis*, i.e. *the tenants*.——*Said among themselves*:—Or, more literally, *to themselves*, that is, *to one another*.——*This is the heir; come, let us kill him, and ours shall be the inheritance*:—An idea as infatuated as it was ferocious and unjust. Why should they presume that their lord would be tolerant for ever?

VER. 8. *And they took him, and killed him, and cast him outside of the vineyard*:—We may suppose, either that the idea is, that *they killed him, and then cast his body outside of the vineyard*, or that the evangelist, after stating the lamentable issue of the struggle, *they killed him*, returns,—on the principle

the vineyard. 9 What shall therefore the lord of the vineyard do? He will come and destroy the husbandmen, and

---

exemplified in such an expression as "*far and near*," to the specification of one of the preliminaries of the tragedy, *they dragged him to the struggle outside the vineyard, and there despatched him.* It is probable that this latter view is his idea. Compare Matt. xxi, 39; Luke xx, 15. But it is, by no means, necessary or warrantable to make,—with Mace, Heumann, and Principal Campbell,—a transposition of clauses in translation. It is as unwarrantable to employ, with Norton, the word *body* in the last clause.———"Who did this?" asks Richard Baxter, looking to the application of the parable; and he answers, "The only national church on earth." "No wonder," he adds, "that no "innocency or worth can preserve the Lord's ministers from their rage, and "from being cast out of the vineyard."

VER. 9. *What, therefore, shall the Lord of the vineyard do?*—The question was addressed to the audience, and we may conceive, if we choose, of our Lord pausing for a reply. Compare Matt. xxi, 40, 41.———We could not learn from Mark, or Luke, whether any of the auditors of our Lord answered his question. But if any did, our Lord took up the answer and iterated it, as from himself,—thus making it his own. It is this, his own answer, which is here recorded,—*He shall come and destroy the husbandmen*:—Putting them, as they deserve, to a violent death.———*And shall give the vineyard to others*:—To farm it for him. More worthy lessees would be obtained.———The application of the parable is obvious. God was the Lord of the vineyard. The vineyard was an enclosed portion of the human race,—the chosen and peculiar people. They were enclosed within fences, that were requisite to protect them from the evil influences rampant in the world at large. There should have been valuable results from such advantages, and from the labours of the appointed workers and overseers. There should have been results acceptable to God. Such results, however, were not forthcoming. The priests and other leaders of the people were shamefully unfaithful to their obligations. But the Lord was gracious, and sent prophet after prophet to remonstrate with them, and to induce them to repent of the error of their ways, and to act in conformity with the covenant, to which they had given their assent. But they would not; and only "shamefully entreated" the noble men who had been sent to them as commissioners. By and by, after the greatest patience and long-suffering, God sent "his only begotten Son," Jesus Himself, the speaker of the parable, to put all things to rights. As he spoke to the priests, and scribes, and elders, he was engaged in his work. But he foresaw that they would persist in their mad and wicked opposition, and finish it by imbruing their hands in his blood. The result would be that their peculiar privileges would be taken from them, and handed over to others. There *is* consequently a change in the theocracy. There is still indeed an enclosure; but it is no longer given to mere formalists of priests, and paltry pedants or scribes, and sordid or worldly-minded elders, to have office and power. The theocracy is spiritual, and all its officers and administrators are spiritual. The fence that surrounds it is spiritual; and, in the fence, there is a spiritual door of entrance for all who are spiritual.

will give the vineyard unto others. 10 And have ye not read this scripture, [1]The stone which the builders [1] Psa. 118. 22.
rejected is become the head of the corner. 11 This was the

---

VER. 10. *And have ye not read this Scripture?*—Very literally, *And did ye not read this Scripture?* that is, in substance, *And did ye never, at any point of time past, read this Scripture?* Note the continuative expression, "*And* did you not," etc. Only one query is formally uttered; but two are implied. It is as if the Saviour had said,—"*Do you not* understand the application of my parable? *And did you never* read this Scripture?" The two things coalesce. —*This Scripture*: Viz. Psalm cxviii. 22. The term *Scripture* is, in its own nature, indefinite in its applicability, and may be used with propriety in reference either to a single written statement, or to a sum of such statements. It is used, as here, with reference to a single written statement—a small component part of that which is emphatically "*the* Scripture"—in Luke iv, 21; John xix, 37; Acts i, 16; viii, 38.———*The stone which the builders rejected*:—*The stone*; literally, *a stone*.—*Rejected*:—Or *disallowed*, as the word is rendered in 1 Pet. ii, 7. *Refused* is Cranmer's rendering, and Tyndale's; and is the word that is employed in the Authorized Version of the Psalms. *Dispised* is Wycliffe's rendering. The term means *disapproved*, and suggests that the stone was subjected to scrutiny, and then condemned and rejected. The reference is probably to some incident that had occurred in the building or rebuilding of the temple. Some stone had been disapproved of for the foundation. It was too insignificant! But on the building was finished, that very stone was elevated into a most conspicuous position. The incident is turned to account by the Psalmist, and by our Lord. It is regarded as illustrating the treatment accorded to the Messiah by those who, in the preliminary Dispensation, had to do with the erection of the temple of humanity, the great spiritual Worship-House of the Most High.———*Is become the head of the corner*:—Or more literally, *This became head of a corner.* More literally still, *This became into a corner's head.* The reference is not, as is generally supposed, to a chief corner stone *in the foundation*, (Eph. ii, 20; 1 Pet. ii, 6), but to a corner stone *in the cornice.* Jesus, in the temple of humanity, is both; but he cannot be represented in the twofold relation, within the limits of one and the same hieroglyphic picture. He is at the head, moreover, of *every* corner, as well as *at every corner's base.* He is at once the foundation, all round and round, and the crown all round and round, of the entire erection. But the architectural figure will not stretch to body forth the whole reality. (See *Commentary on Matthew*, xxi, 42.)

VER. 11. The quotation continues. *This was the Lord's doing*:—More literally, *This came to pass from the Lord.* The reference of the *This* has been disputed. The word is feminine in the original (αὕτη), as if it referred to the *head* of the corner,—a word that is also feminine (κεφαλή). But it is more probable that, being taken from the Septuagint, it is a mere verbatim translation of the Hebrew pronoun זֹאת, which—although really meaning *this thing* (that is, here, *this occurrence*)—is idiomatically of feminine gender. (See *Commentary on Matthew*, xxi, 42.) The occurrence referred to, the elevation of the despised stone to the cornice at an angle, or rather, the elevation of the Person adumbrated by the Stone, was traceable to the overruling agency of

Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes? 12 And they [m]sought to lay hold on him, but feared the people: for they knew that he had spoken the parable against them: and they left him, and went their way.

13 [n]And they send unto him certain of the Pharisees and of the [o]Herodians, to catch him in *his*

[m] Chap. 11. 18.

[n] M. t. 22. 16. Luke 20. 20.

[o] Chap. 3. 6.

---

the Lord. His heart and his hand were in the matter.———*And it is marvellous in our eyes*: The occurrence is a fitting object of human wonder. And such 'wonder' is not merely 'the daughter of human ignorance.' It is the sister of admiration, and may be allied to the very highest possibility of knowledge.

Ver. 12. *And they sought to lay hold on him*:–*They*,—the priests, scribes, and elders. They were anxious to get our Lord arrested, so that they might, in some way or other, get rid of him.—*They sought*:–They desired, and consulted, and schemed. The word is translated *desired* in Luke ix, 9, as also in Matt. xii, 46, 47.———*But feared the people*:–Instead of *but*, it is *and* in the original, (καί). The evangelist had it in his option, either to speak in a continuative manner, or to introduce a contrast. He chose the former alternative.—*The people*:–The original expression is not so generic, (ὄχλον). It means *the crowd that was there and then surrounding our Saviour.*———*For*:–This introduces a reason for what is stated, not in the immediately preceding clause, but in that which goes before it, and which was of overshadowing significance.———*They knew that he had spoken the parable against them*:–Or, more literally, *in reference to them.* Their *amour propre* was thus wounded. Meyer unnaturally interprets the *they* as designating the crowd, in order to avoid the hyperbaton, or vaulting, of the reference in the reason-rendering particle. He has hence to assume a leaping back of the reference in the *they* of the following clause.———*And they left him, and departed*:–They could not at that time make anything more of the case.

Verses 13—17 constitute a paragraph corresponding to Matt. xxii, 16—22, and Luke xx, 20—26.

Ver. 13. *And they send unto him*:–*They*,—the baffled priests, scribes, and elders. Meyer fancies a contradictory account in Matthew, because the Pharisees are there specified (xxii, 15). But what more likely than that the scheme should originate with a certain class?—and indeed in an individual mind?—They send *certain of the Pharisees*:–Picked men no doubt, able, unscrupulous, and subtle.———*And of the Herodians*:–Politicians, who had lost faith in everything supernatural and divine in Judaism and the Jewish Scriptures. The radiance from above that rested on the superincumbent darkness, was, to them, mere moonshine. The aspirations of the ancient 'fakeers' of the nation, and thence of the masses of the people, after a glorious royalty and theocracy, were, in their estimation, reasonably and sufficiently realized in the Herodian dynasty. See on chap. iii, 6.———*In order that they might catch him in his words*:–Or more literally, and as it is in the Rheims version, *in his word.* Still more literally, and as it is in Wycliffe, *in word.* But more literally yet, *by word.* The term *word*, however, is far from doing justice to the Greek original, (λόγῳ). We have no precise English equivalent. It is

words. 14 And when they were come, they say unto him, Master, we know that thou art [p] true, and carest for no man: for thou [q] regardest not the person of men,

[p] John 8. 16.

[q] Prov. 24. 23.

---

rendered *task* in Matt. xxii, 15. The aim of the 'hunters' was to get hold of our Lord *by means of something that he might say.* They resolved to construct, out of their discordances, a snare for getting him to say something that might be available against him, either with the Jewish people on the one hand, or with the Roman authorities on the other. The verb rendered *they might catch* (ἵνα αὐτὸν ἀγρεύσωσιν) is a 'hunting' word. They wanted to throw a lasso round him, or otherwise entrap him. We shall see how, in what follows.

VER. 14. The scheme has been agreed upon, and the 'hunters' stealthily approach their game. *And when they were come, they say to him, Master*:—Or *Teacher.* No doubt the word actually employed would be the Jewish one, *Rabbi.* They would use the title obsequiously, as if they were animated with feelings of the profoundest deference.——*We know that thou art true*:—*True*, that is, ingenuous, honest, transparent. There is no veneering in thy teaching. The word *true* in Greek is beautiful and suggestive, ἀληθής,—*unconcealed, real.* It is probable that the 'hunters' had, at bottom, a kind of actual faith in the honesty of our Lord. The very consciousness of their own duplicity and unreality might suggest, on the principle of contraries, the turn which they gave to their compliment.——*And thou dost not care for any one*: False in a certain sense, for our Lord cared for every one. But it was true in the sense intended by the 'hunters.' Our Lord would not trim to please any one. He would not shrink from declaring "the *present* truth," however much offence it might give to the high and mighty, on the one hand, or to the many-headed and many-handed multitude on the other.——*For thou regardest not the person of man*:—A strange kind of expression, full of phraseological fossils. The word *person* originally meant *a mask, through which a play-actor made sounds,* (persona). It then denoted *a certain character played;* and thence, *a self-regulating actor, a self-conscious agent.* In the expression before us it has an intermediate meaning,—*the outward appearance.* And such is the translation of the word in Myles Coverdale's version (1535), and in Lord Cromwell's Bible (1539). The Geneva and the Rheims have *person.* Tyndale has, still more freely, *degree.* But the Greek word (πρόσωπον) neither corresponds to *degree,* nor *person,* nor exactly to *outward appearance.* It simply means *face* or *countenance,* so that the 'hunters' say, *for thou lookest not to the countenance of man.* What did they mean? Viewing the expression from a purely Greek standpoint, one might suppose that it meant, *for thou regardest not mere appearance, or profession. Thou lookest behind to the real character.* That, however, is not the idea. The expression has within it the fossil of a popular Hebrew idiom. The phrase *to lift up the face of any one* (נָשָׂא פָּנִים) meant, in Hebrew, *to be gracious to him, to show him favour.* When suppliants came before a king,—in those olden times when the idioms of the Semitic tongue were being formed,—they prostrated themselves on the ground. If the Monarch was disposed to be gracious, *he lifted up their countenances,*—that is, *he allowed them to look him in the face and to present their case before him.* He thus too, himself, looked upon their faces, and

but teachest the [r] way of God in truth. Is it lawful [r] Psa. 27. 11.

beheld them graciously. If he was resolved, however, not to be favourable, he refused to let them look up. In Hebrew idiom, *he turned away their countenances*, and caused them *to return back whence they came*. See 1 Kings ii, 16, 17, 20; 2 Chron. vi, 42. It was bountiful in a Sovereign to lift up the countenance of a suppliant. But if the Sovereign was acting at the time as a Judge between contending parties, who had carried their appeal to his bar, then, to have prejudged the case by lifting up the face of one of the litigants, while the other's countenance was turned away, would have been criminal partiality. Hence the evil of *respect of persons* in a Judge, or the lifting up of the face of one of the contending parties at the bar. (Ps. lxxxii, 2; Prov. xviii, 5; Mal. ii, 9.) But the principle of impartiality extends its application beyond the professional acts of professional judges. All men are more or less judicial; and they should be impartial when they judge. More particularly should they guard against bias in the presence of the rich and the great. Public teachers very particularly, or preachers and Rabbis, should be constantly on their guard against favouritism for persons who owe their elevation in society to causes that have no connection with moral superiority. Hence the adroitness of the address of the 'hunters' who came to our Lord,—*for thou lookest not to the face of men.* It is as if they had said, *Thou art far removed from a spirit of partiality and favouritism. There is no fear of thee having regard to the great, however great, when thou givest thy judgement regarding any act, or course of action.*———*But teachest the way of God*:–Not *the way in which God himself goes*, but *the way which he has laid out for men to go in.*———*In truth*:–Literally, *upon truth*, that is, says Euthymius, *truly*. And such is the translation of Tyndale, Coverdale, and the Geneva. The 'hunters' tried to flatter our Lord by saying that his teaching was based *upon truth.*——— All up to this point was a 'flattening' or clearing of the way. Now comes the lasso,—*Is it lawful to give tribute to Cæsar, or not?*–That is, *Is it lawful, or is it not, to pay taxes to the Roman emperor?* It is often supposed that the reference of the querists was to the capitation-tax, imposed on the Jewish people by the Romans. So Schleusner, Bretschneider, Wahl, Robinson, Schirlitz, Grimm, among the lexicographers. So too Hesychius in his Lexicon (*sub voce* κῆνσος), and the writer of the *Codex Bezæ*, who, in place of the generic Latin term *census*, used by the evangelist, substitutes the specific Greek term for poll-tax, (ἐπικεφάλαιον). But the question addressed to our Lord derived its significance not from the particular form of any of the taxes imposed by the victorious Romans. It drew deeper,—*Had any Gentile a right to tax the chosen people of God? Should any Jew recognize such a right?* The Pharisees, in general, had high ideas of the prerogatives of the chosen people. When they paid their taxes to the Romans, it was under a silent protest; and they would have been glad to witness the inception and consummation of any movement, that would have lifted the foreign yoke off the neck of the people. The Herodians, again, though politicians, rather than religionists, were of patriotic principles, and wished to see, at the head of the nation, a Herod, into whose exchequer, in place of that of the Roman emperor, all taxes, dues, or customs should be paid. In their heart they were opposed, like the Pharisees,

to give tribute to Cæsar, or not? 15 Shall we give, or shall we not give? But he, knowing their hypocrisy, said unto them, Why tempt ye me? bring me a [1]penny, that I may see *it*. 16 And they brought *it*. And he

[1] Valuing of our money seven pence halfpenny, as Mat. 18. 28.

---

to the payment of taxes to Cæsar. They knew that Jesus would be well aware of their distinguishing principles. The Pharisees too, were sure that he would be aware of their distinctive views. And hence they unitedly hoped that he would not fear to speak out in their presence, if he really was opposed, in his heart, to the Roman rule. And if he should thus speak out, they had resolved, apparently, to denounce him to the Roman Governor as disaffected, like Judas of Galilee (*Joseph. Ant.* xviii. 1, 6; *Wars*, ii, 8, 1), to the Roman emperor, and politically dangerous to the Roman supremacy. But if, instead of saying *Nay*, he should chance to say *Yea*, they were resolved, in that case, not to be balked of their prey, but to denounce him to the people as basely acting in collusion with their oppressors. It was a cunningly constructed lasso.

VER. 15. *Shall we give, or shall we not give?*—The break in our Authorized Version, between this verse and the former, comes awkwardly in at this place,—and no doubt in consequence of some casual oversight or mistake. Robert Stephens in his 1551 edition,—the edition in which the verses were introduced,—appropriately postponed the break till after the clause, *—Shall we give, or shall we not give?* Beza too. The Elzevirs too. Mill too. And in fact all the critical editions of the Greek text; and the uncritical too. The same postponement occurs in the German, Dutch, and French versions; and also in the English editions of Wells, Mace, Worsley, Wakefield, Young, Godwin. The awkward break occurs, however, in the Geneva, and had thence been inadvertently imported into our Authorized Version. A more literal translation of the clause would be, *Should we give, or should we not give?* In the former clause, at the conclusion of the preceding verse, the question concerns a general principle; in this, there is reference to the application of the principle to the acting of the people.——*But he knew their hypocrisy*: Or, as Tischendorf gives it, on the authority of the Sinaitic and Cambridge manuscripts, *But he saw their hypocrisy,* (εἰδών instead of εἰδώς). Their masks could not conceal from his eye. He saw at a glance that they were playing a part on a stage of unreality, for the iniquitous purpose of entrapping him. (The original meaning of the word *hypocrite* is *stageplayer.*) They were not wishing advice from him how to act, neither were they wishing his help to solve for them a perplexing problem. They were simply laying a snare.——*And said to them, Why tempt ye me?*—Why play recklessly with your consciences, in *trying me*, and *trying to wile me* to my injury? To *tempt* is to *try*: see on chap. x, 2.——*Bring me a penny*: Literally, *a denarius,*—the standard silver coin of the Romans, of somewhat less value, so far as amount of silver is concerned, than a shilling sterling.——*That I may see (it)*:—He wished to intermix the element of ocular demonstration with the remarks which he was about to make.

VER. 16. *And they brought (one)*:—The picture of the scene is so vividly drawn by the evangelist, that we seem to see with our eyes the successive

saith unto them, Whose *is* this image and superscription? And they said unto him, Cæsar's. 17 And Jesus answering said unto them, [s]Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to [t]God the things that are God's. And they marvelled at him.

[s] Rom. 13. 7. 1 Pet. 2. 17.
[t] 1 Chr. 16. 28. Psa. 29. 1.

occurrences. The coin is handed to our Lord. He examines it.———*And he says to them, Whose is this image and superscription?*–As if he had said, *The coin, I perceive, has the likeness of some royal personage stamped upon it; and it bears an inscription or legend. Whose is the likeness? Whose name is mentioned in the legend?* The word translated *superscription* does not denote that the name was written *above* the head: it has only reference to the fact that it was written *upon* the coin. Wycliffe renders it *the in-wrytinge.* If he had said *the on-writing,* the translation would have been perfect.———*But they said to him, Cæsar's*:–*Cæsar* was properly the surname of the Julian family, and, in particular, of the great Julius; but, being assumed by Octavianus Augustus, became thence, for a considerable time, attached to his successors in the imperial throne. Purvey and Coverdale render the word *Emperor.* To this day *Kaiser* is the word used in Germany for *Emperor.*

Ver. 17. *But Jesus said to them*:–The word *answering* is omitted in ℵBCLΔ, 33, and is left out by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford.———*Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's. And they marvelled at him*:–They *marvelled.* It is the imperfect tense,—*They stood marvelling.* No wonder. Instead of finding him eager to plunge headlong, as they had expected, into the determination of an exciting political question, and thus into the pit which they had digged for him, they saw him vaulting at a bound to an eminence on the other side of their snare, whence he preaches to them a lesson which could not fail to command the homage of their consciences. He assumes, what could not be denied, that they had relations to Cæsar as well as to God. The currency of Cæsar's coin among them was evidence of the fact. It was hence the case that they had obligations, of some kind or other, to discharge toward him. *See,* said he, *that you conscientiously discharge these. See that you be not merely recipients of benefits. In whatsoever sphere you get, in that same sphere you have to give.* All men have duties to discharge to the civil rulers or magistrates under whose authority they enjoy protection and other blessings. They owe something—they owe much—to society around them, and hence to its representative men. But there is a wider sphere still, that comprehends and dominates all the spheres of social organization. There is the sphere of the Divine and the Infinite. Men are placed there; and there they "live and move and have their being." There and thence they enjoy all the blessings which make "being" desirable or delightful. Hence they have duties to perform toward God. Even in relation to Him, infinite though He be, they should not be receivers only. They should be givers too. They should "render to Him the things that are His," that is, they should *give away, and from themselves* (ἀπόδοτε), to Him, the things which of right belong to Him. It is their duty; and their privilege too. For even in relation to God, "it is more blessed to give than to receive." And when He actually gets the things which constitute the fitting tribute of the homage, service, and

18 [u]Then come unto him the Sadducees, [v]which say there is no resurrection; and they asked him, 19 saying, Master, Moses [w]wrote unto us, If a man's [x]brother die, and leave *his* wife *behind him,* and

[u] Mat. 22. 23. Luke 20. 27.
[v] Acts 23. 8.
[w] Deut. 25. 5.
[x] Ruth 1. 11.

love, which are his due, then a principle is got hold of, which adjusts into its proper proportion the amount of tribute, material or moral, that is due to men.—The Saviour, thus, instead of leaping into the thicket of a petty political question of the day, ascended a peak of moral thought, and legislated for all peoples and persons, in all places and times.

Verses 18–27 constitute a paragraph that corresponds to Matt. xxii, 23—33, and Luke xx, 27—38.

Ver. 18. *Then come unto him the Sadducees*:–Or, more literally, *And there come Sadducees to him.* That is, *certain Sadducees.* The interest in the Great Rabbi got more and more contagious. Within the courts of the temple there would be numerous representatives of all the classes of Jewish society. Some would be walking up and down, wrapped in their meditations, or conversing together. Others would be standing in clusters engaged in keen debate. But Jesus gradually became *the* centre of attraction. Some around him might be in the secret of the Sanhedrim's plot. Others would be ingenuously charmed by the wonderful matter, and equally wonderful manner, of his teaching. While others still, big with theological or philosophical self-conceit, would be eager to try their hand in shutting him up dialectically within one or other of their favourite common-places. Among this last class, apparently, was the knot of Sadducees who now approached, and threw out upon him their grappling-hooks of argumentation.———*Who say that there is no resurrection*:–It is a compound pronoun, that is rendered *who,* or *which,* (οἵτινες). It represents the Sadducees specified as belonging to a certain class. *They were of that class of people who say that there is no resurrection.* Note the negative form of their tenet. All their distinctive tenets were negative. (See *Reuss's Article in Herzog's Encyklop.*) And not only did they object to the doctrine of the resurrection, they objected to the kindred and more comprehensive doctrine of immortality. They seized, indeed, on the idea of resurrection simply as vantage ground, on which to dispute the idea of immortality. "They deny," says Josephus, "the immortality of the soul, and the punishments and rewards of Hades." (*Wars,* ii, 8, 14.) They had thus no basis in their thoughts for the highest and most ennobling of aspirations. ———*And they interrogated him, saying*:–As follows in verses 19—23.

Ver. 19. *Master*:–Literally *Teacher,* or *Rabbi.*———*Moses wrote to us*:–Viz. in Deut. xxv, 5. There follows a conjunction in the original, standing before the quotation, (*that* or ὅτι). But it is, as critics say, *recitative,* and therefore not to be translated in English. It simply points demonstratively forward. ———*If a man's brother should die, and leave a wife, and not leave children*:–It is *a child* in the Vatican manuscript, and a few other authorities; and Tischendorf has received that reading into his text. Wrongly. The reading bewrays an annotator's hand, who took into account, lawyer-like, that the want of *a single child* exposed the widowed woman to the contingency about to be specified. The word *leave* occurs twice in our translation; but two distinct

leave no children, that his brother should take his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother. 20 Now there were seven

---

verbs are used in the original. The first (καταλίπῃ) means properly *to leave down*, at one's feet as it were, and then *to leave behind:* the second (ἀφῇ) means primarily *to send forth*, and thence *to throw up, to relinquish, to leave.* Wakefield's translation of the whole clause is, *and leave a wife without children.* ———*That*:–Literally, *in order that*, (ἵνα). It is at this point that the emphasis of what Moses wrote comes in. What precedes is but preamble. The gist and aim of his writing was *in order that* the domestic result, hereafter specified, might be realized.———*His brother should take his wife*:–Viz., in marriage. Instead of *his wife*, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford read *the wife*, under the sanction of ℵBCLΔ, 1, and the Coptic version. Right. A species of 'communal' relationship is subindicated. The statute must be regarded as relative to some exceedingly offensive matrimonial condition which had prevailed,—probably *polyandry.* It is the obverse of the more common *polygamy*, and had, in certain conditions of social degradation, cropt up into use and wont. "Polyandry," says Sir John Lubbock, "is far less common than polygamy, though more frequent than is generally supposed." (*Origin of Civilization*, p. 115.) Sometimes one band of brothers, kenneling in one homestead, would be the common husbands of one wife. "Among the Todas of the "Neilgherry Hills," says Sir John, "when a man marries a girl, she becomes "the wife of all his brothers as they successively reach manhood, and they also "become the husbands of all her sisters as they become old enough to marry. "In this case the first-born child is fathered upon the eldest brother, the next-"born on the second, and so on throughout the series." (*Origin of Civilization*, p. 74.) Sir John says again, "Polyandry is no doubt very widely distributed "over India, Thibet, and Ceylon. In the latter island the joint husbands are "always brothers." (*Ditto*, p. 117.) When such a custom has, unhappily, got ingrained in the habits of a degraded people, it is not possible to induce them to leap, at a bound, to a lofty pinnacle of marital purity. The ascent—in general at least—must be gradual. And hence the utmost that can be achieved by progressive legislators, is to take one step upward at a time. It was thus that Moses had to deal with the Hebrews, who had been, for so long a period, trampled down, in Egypt, into the mire of a degraded servile condition. Hence the statute referred to by the Sadducees. It was no doubt intended to limit the rights of brothers to succession, in place of contemporaneity, and thus to promote, as much as might be, the development of the idea of monogamy. It would be intended, too, to protect the interests of widowed females, by giving them, when inheritances were involved, a claim upon those who would obtain their deceased husband's effects. A corresponding custom still prevails, or till recently prevailed, among the Kalmucks. "If a husband die, his widow becomes the property of his brother, provided the brother chooses to accept of her." (*Clarke's Travels in Russia, Tartary, and Turkey*, vol i, p. 315.)———*And raise up seed to his brother*:–*Seed, issue*, perhaps that the line of inheritance might, as far as possible, run on according to the ideal of the first marriage.

VER. 20. *Now*:–Or *then*, or *therefore.* Such are the two translations,

brethren: and the first took a wife, and dying left no seed. 21 And the second took her, and died, neither left he any seed: and the third likewise. 22 And the seven had her, and left no seed: last of all the woman died also. 23 In the resurrection therefore, when they shall rise, whose wife shall she be of them? for the seven had her to wife. 24 And

---

which, in other passages, the original term (οὖν) generally receives. The idea is, *This being the case,—This being the state of the law.* But it is probable that the term was wanting altogether in Mark's autograph. It is not found in the manuscripts ℵABC*LXΓΔΠ, and it is omitted not only by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, but also by Bengel, Matthaei, Griesbach, and Scholz. It is wanting too in all the editions of Erasmus and Robert Stephens; and in Mill. Beza, however, added it to the text, in his 1588 and 1598 editions, on the authority of the Cambridge manuscript. He had previously added it in his *Notæ*. Thence it was inserted in the Elzevirs, and got established in the currently *Received Text*, and was also translated in our Authorized Version.——*There were seven brothers*:—We may either suppose, with Theophylact, that the Sadducees feigned, for argument's sake, the case which they state, or, with Petter, that they had got hold of some extraordinary fact which had actually occurred once upon a time, and which, when got hold of by them, became their favourite armoury of argument while debating on their peculiar views. This latter view is probably the more correct.——*And the first*:—The eldest of the brotherhood.——*Took a wife, and, dying, left no seed*:—No issue.

VER. 21. *And the second took her, and died; neither left he any seed: and the third likewise*: The Sadducees make their argument graphic by spreading out the case.—We may imagine that there had been some idiosyncrasy in the physical constitution of the brothers that developed into fatal results in early manhood.

VER. 22. *And the seven had her, and left no seed*:—Instead of *had her*, it is *took her* in the original. But in the manuscripts ℵBCLΔ, and 33, the phrase simply runs thus, *and the seven left no seed*, it being assumed that they successively took her and had her. Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford have received this abbreviated reading into the text. And Meyer approves of it. Rightly.——*Last of all the woman also died*: *Also*, for sooner or later every one must fall.

VER. 23. *In the resurrection therefore*:—The *therefore* is omitted by a large proportion of the best manuscripts, inclusive of the Sinaitic, Vatican, and Parisian (ℵBC*). It is hence left out by Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford. Rightly.——*When they shall rise*:—*They*, that is, not men in general, but the seven brothers, along with the woman.——*Whose wife shall she be of them?* Literally, *of which of them shall she be wife?*——*For the seven had her to wife*: That is, *to be wife*, or, *had her as wife*. There is nothing, however, in the original corresponding to *as* or *to*. Wycliffe gives it literally, *hadden hir wyf*. The seven *had her successively a wife*. Wakefield and Norton translate freely, *for all the seven married her*. So Principal Campbell, *for she hath been wife to them all.*

VER. 24. *And Jesus answering said to them*: The manuscripts ℵBCLΔ, 33,

Jesus answering said unto them, Do ye not therefore err, because ye know not the [y]scriptures, neither the [z]power of God? 25 For when they shall rise from the dead, they neither marry, nor are given in marriage; [a]but are as the angels which are in heaven. 26 And as touching the dead, that they rise,—have ye not read

[y] P.s. 119. 105. [z] Gen. 18. 14. [a] 1 Cor. 15. 42.

---

and Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, omit the word *answering*.———*Do ye not therefore err?–Err*, or *wander*, viz. from the right view of the subject. We have our word *planet*, or *wandering star*, from the term that is employed (πλανᾶσθε). The *therefore*, or *on-account-of-this* (διὰ τοῦτο) looks forward, as Erasmus remarks, to the twofold clause that immediately follows. The interrogative form of the address challenges the assent of their own unbiassed reason. The ground on which the challenge is supported is found in verses 25–27. ———*Because ye know not the Scriptures, neither the power of God*:–Ye do err by not knowing the Scriptures on the one hand, nor the power of God on the other.

Ver. 25. *For when they shall rise from the dead*:–*They*, that is, men in general,—for by this time the thought has travelled forward from the specific standpoint to the generic.—*From the dead*:–Literally *from among the dead*, or *out of the dead*. But the expression had got to be idiomatically equivalent to, *from the state of death*.———*They neither marry, nor are given in marriage*:–It might have been said, *they neither marry, nor are married*,—the two expressions denoting the respective attitudes of the two sexes. But instead of such a generic statement, a specific phase of conventional marriage-customs in relation to females is brought into view. Not only *are they married*, they are *given in marriage*. Comp. 1 Cor. vii, 38.———*But are as the angels*:–Literally, *as angels*.———*Who are in the heavens*:–In a large number of manuscripts, inclusive of the Sinaitic, the Parisian, and the Cambridge, the expression is simply *in the heavens*. But the *who are* (or *οἱ*) is also found in about an equal number of the uncials, inclusive of the Alexandrian, and the Vatican. It is a matter of no moment exegetically which of the two readings be adopted. In his 1849 and 1859 editions, Tischendorf inserted the articulating phrase. In his 8th edition he has thrown it out. So did Griesbach, Scholz, Lachmann.—In the resurrection-state there will not be a repetition, pure and simple, of present conditions. There will be advance of inward and outward development. Love will continue; but, in the case of the holy, it will be sublimed. "The power of God" is adequate, not only to the re-formative, but also to the transformative changes that may be requisite; and his wisdom will see to it that they be in harmony with the perfectibility of individual personality, and the general procession of the ages. Even on earth there are loftier loves than those that are merely marital.

Ver. 26. *And as touching the dead*:–Or, *But concerning the dead*:–The Saviour turns from the consideration of the plastic "power of God," to the doctrine of the Old Testament Scriptures.———*That they rise*:–This is the position that was gainsaid by the Sadducees, and affirmed by their theological opponents. It is expressed, with a kind of technical precision, in the form of a thesis.———*Have ye not read?*–It is the aorist tense,—*Did ye not read?*–It

in the [b]book of Moses, how in the bush God spake [b] Exod. 3. 6.
unto him, saying, I *am* the God of Abraham, and the God
of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? 27 He is [c]not the [c] John 5, 24-26.

---

is as if it were said, *Did ye never, in time past, read?*———*In the Book of Moses*:-The Pentateuch. (Exod. iii, 2—6.)———*How in the bush*:-Or, more literally, *on the bush* (ἐπὶ τοῦ βάτου). But in the original the *how* comes after *on the bush*, and should, by our translators, have been kept in that, its proper place. The same transposition, however, had unluckily been made, before them, by Erasmus, Tyndale, Coverdale, Calvin, Beza. None of these critics saw that the expression had a titular and topical reference to a certain portion of the Pentateuch. Such, however, is undoubtedly the case,—*in the Passage or Paragraph on the Bush.* Compare Rom. xi, 2. It was customary for the Hebrews to refer in this manner to out-standing portions of their Scriptures. See Jablonsky. The Greeks and Romans had a corresponding custom. Bloomfield says that Beza explained the expression in this, the natural way. But the fact is emphatically otherwise. In every one of his editions, Beza gives and defends the transpositive interpretation; and his influence, we doubt not, weighed with our translators. Almost all modern critics, however, oppose his view, and Luther and Wycliffe, in their respective versions, give the natural and correct translation. Wycliffe's is as follows,—*have ye not read in the book of Moyses on the bousche, how God seide to him.* ———*How God spoke to him, saying, I (am) the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob*:-Such is the statement on which the Saviour erects his argument. See next verse.

VER. 27. *He is not the God of the dead but of the living*:-This is the best supported reading. See Tischendorf's 8th edition.—The Saviour considers, (1), that the declaration of God to Moses demonstrates that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are alive; and he assumes, (2), that if Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are really alive, there will be a resurrection. He does not argue the validity of his assumption; for he knew that the real difficulty of the Sadducees did not concern the specific doctrine of the resurrection, as something over and above the generic doctrine of immortality. It centred in the generic doctrine,—"for the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, *neither angel, nor spirit.*" (Acts xxiii, 8.. Josephus merges out of view altogether their difficulty in reference to the resurrection, when he says,—"They take away the belief of the immortal duration of the soul, and the punishments and rewards in Hades." (*Wars*, ii, 8, 14.) Their objection to the idea of resurrection was, in short, just their outward and pictorial way of objecting to the idea of immortality. It was the external robe of a more inward idea. Prove to them immortality, and they would no longer contend against resurrection;—for the idea of resurrection was to them, and, when looked at from the highest standpoint, it is to all, simply the complement of the idea of immortality. It resolves itself into this,—*If men are to live for ever, they will live in their entire selves.* Everlasting life will not be realized in a fragment of existence, as in an arch of being springing for ever but half way over. The Saviour agreed with the Sadducees in this conception; and hence, assuming it, he contented himself with demonstrating *that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are alive.* The only

God of the dead, [d]but the God of the living: ye therefore do greatly [e]err.

[d] Heb. 11, 16.
[e] Verse 24.

question that remains, therefore, is this,—*Is the demonstration valid?* It must be. It is,—though many a critic, looking only at the surface of the phraseology, has failed to lay his finger on the vital nerve of the argument. The argument, it is manifest, is not caught when the word *am* is laid hold of,—*am* as distinguished from the praeterite *was:* "I *am* the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." There is no *am* in Mark's Greek, and none in the Hebrew of Moses. The argument, therefore, dips deeper. What is it? God sustained a relation of gracious peculiarity to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. He was "their God." He opened out, that is to say, in a peculiar manner, in his relation to these patriarchs, the fulness of the resources of his 'Godhead.' Why? Was it because of a feeling of capricious favouritism? Was it to make the specified patriarchs wealthier than all others? Or healthier? Or more cultured? Or more sensuously happy? Or more powerful? No. In these respects they did not excel all others. In several of these respects they were inferior to some others. Consider Abraham himself, the chief of the three. He "went out, not knowing whither he went," and "sojourned in the land of "promise, as in a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles." (Heb. xi, 8, 9.) So far was it from being the case that he was, in all terrestrial respects, superior to all others. What then? In what way was the fulness of the Godhead lavished on the Hebrew patriarchs? *In a way that had reference to a life to come.* "These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having "seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and "confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. *For they that "say such things, declare plainly that they seek a country.*"—"God is not "ashamed *to be called their God, for he prepared for them a city.*" (Heb. xi, 13, 14, 16.) If it was not with reference to the life to come, that God became "the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob," then there was nothing peculiar in God's relation to the Hebrew patriarchs. And if all peculiarity of relationship be denied, then all the peculiar Jewish institutions, founded on these relations, were illusory, and "the Book of Moses" was a Fable. This, however, the Sadducees, as self-conscious Jews, were not prepared to admit; and hence the Saviour's demonstration—based on the Scriptures which they and he held in common—was unanswerable and irrefragable. It amounted to this,—*If there was at all a Patriarchal dispensation, embracing a Messianic or Redemptive scheme, and thus involving a divinely commissioned Messiah or Redeemer, who was to be in due time incarnated, then there must be a life to come. But there was such a Dispensation, if it be the case that God became "the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob," in any distinctive sense whatever.* And then, moreover, as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob took personal advantage of the Messianic Covenant, into which God entered with them, they "live." They have "life,"—"everlasting life," in the intense acceptation of the term. They not only exist consciously. Their self-conscious existence is normal, and harmonious with itself. It is ideal life. It is bliss. "The righteous by faith *shall live.*" (Habakkuk ii, 4; Rom. i, 16, 17.)——*Ye therefore do greatly err*:—The *there-*

28 *f* And one of the scribes came, and having *f* Mat. 22, 35.
heard them reasoning together, and perceiving that he had answered them well, asked him, Which is the first commandment of all? 29 And Jesus answered him, The first of all

---

*for* is wanting in the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts, as also in CLΔ, and the Coptic Version. It is omitted by Tischendorf, and might be, not unlikely, the gloss of an early student. At all events the spirit of the Saviour's argumentation is not impoverished by the omission.—The Sadducees entirely misunderstood the mystery and meaning at once of their own Jewish Scriptures, and of the various ordinances, which entered as elements into the peculiarity of the national constitution of their people.

Verses 28—34 constitute a paragraph corresponding to Matthew xxii, 35—40.

Ver. 28. *And one of the scribes came, and having heard them reasoning together, and perceiving that he had answered them well, asked him*:—It is rather a complicated string of clauses in the original, —for there is no *and* before *perceiving*, and the participle rendered *perceiving* is neither present nor aoristic, but perfect, *having perceived*, that is, *knowing*. The clauses resolve themselves into two clusters; the first, *and one of the scribes came, who heard them reasoning together*:—The second, *knowing that he answered them well, he asked him*. There should be a pause, in reading, between the two clusters.—*One of the scribes*:—Of nobler nature than the most of the rest, or of more unsophisticated character.———*Came*:—That is, *approached*. He stepped forward from the multitude, and respectfully addressed our Lord.———*Who heard them reasoning together*:—He had listened to the discussion between our Lord and the Sadducees.———*Knowing that he answered them well*:—Very literally, *beautifully*. *Admirably*, as it were. Rodolphus Dickinson uses freely the word *ably*. Petter explains thus, —"truly and soundly, as also wisely." Instead of *knowing* (εἰδώς), Tischendorf and Tregelles read, aoristically, *when he saw* (ἰδών), under the sanction of ℵ CDL, 1. The sanction, however, is not sufficient. Still less is the sanction for Fritzsche's reading, *and when he saw* (καὶ ἰδών). Such readings are the result of not observing that the clauses adjust themselves into two clusters.———*He asked him, which is the first commandment of all?*—The *which* denotes quality, (ποία). *Of what nature, of what kind, is the first commandment of all?* What is its essence? The expression is one of several possible ways of putting substantially the same question. There is a peculiarity in the gender of the original word *all*, (πάντων instead of πασῶν). The logical neutrality of the idea of the things referred to immerges out of sight, for a moment, the rhetorical femininity of the vocable employed.—*The first*:—"The principal," says Wesley, "and most necessary to be observed."

Ver. 29. *And Jesus answered him*: Or, as Tischendorf, following ℵBLΔ, 33, more briefly has it, *Jesus answered.*———*The first of all the commandments is*: Or simply,—according to the manuscripts ℵBLΔ, and Tischendorf, Tregelles, Meyer, Alford,—*The first is.* There are great variations in the manuscripts as regards the form of this clause; but they are of no exegetical moment. They seem all to be expansions of the reading,—*The first is.* ———*Hear, O Israel, the*

the commandments *is*, [g]Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God is [h]one Lord: 30 and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength.

[g] Deut. 6. 4.
[h] 2 Ki. 19, 15. Eph. 4. 6.

*Lord our God is one Lord*:–See Deut. vi, 4, 5. This is the preamble to the commandment, and is, as Wesley says, "the foundation of the first commandment, yea of all the commandments." All the Infinities must be modes of one Absolute Infinity; and that one Absolute Infinity must be the Being of God. If, however, instead of the word *God* we substitute the word *gods*, we annihilate the idea of Godhead; for we have then, in our conception, but parts and parcels of infinity. We have, in fact, descended from the infinite to the finite.

VER. 30. *And thou shalt love*:–"Love," says Richard Baxter, "is the final act of the soul." It is the soul's essence seeking, in some 'otherhood,' its final end. In its consummation, it is the soul's self embracing its perfect 'otherhood.'———*The Lord*:–In Hebrew, *Jehovah*, or *Jahveh*. He is the Perfect 'Otherhood' of the soul.———*Thy God*: The term *Jehovah* is absolute, but the term *God* is relative. We cannot say, *my* or *thy Jehovah;* but we can say, *my God, thy God, our God*. God is relative to us as the perfect object of our adoration, obedience, confidence, and love. The fulness of his Godhead is the inexhaustible source out of which we get all that is truly desirable. ———*With all thy heart*:–Literally, *out of thy whole heart*. The representation in Matthew (xxii, 37) is different, but harmonious. Our love to God is to drain, not one district only of the heart, or several, but the entire length and breadth of the domain. The word *heart* has not here its modern psychological import of the special seat of the affections. It has its more primitive import of *the interior of our nature*, the centre or core of our complex being, as distinguished from the physical periphery. See chap. ii, 6, 8; iii, 5; iv, 15; vi, 52; vii, 6, 19, 21; viii, 17; xi, 23. (See also Oehler's *Article on Herz* in Herzog's *Real-Encyk.*)———*And with all thy soul*:–Literally, *and out of thy whole soul*. The word *soul*, like the word *heart*, does not denote any particular power, energy, or capacity of the inner nature, but the inner nature itself, under the phase of *the self-conscious life-essence*. The heart *is* the self-conscious life-essence; or, under another phase, it is the sphere in which the life-essence is self-conscious. There is an idea of locality in the word *heart*. The soul is at home in the heart. Hence we do not, in general, speak of *the immortality of the heart*. But we speak of *the immortality of the soul*. Herodotus, in his day, used the same expression: he says that "the Egyptians were the first who maintained that *the soul of man* (ἀνθρώπου ψυχή) is immortal" (ii, 123).———*And with all thy mind*:–Or, *and out of thy whole mind*. The word here rendered *mind* (διάνοια) naturally denotes some act of the discriminative intelligence. But—as in Plato's *De Legibus*, xi, 2—it is freely and indefinitely employed to designate the mind itself, as the subject of the acts of intellectual discrimination. Plato,—in the passage referred to,—uses the word to denote that entire hemisphere of our being, which is over against the body (σῶμα). The *mind* thus *is* the *heart*, and the *soul;* but it is the *heart and soul* in that particular phase that brings intelligence into view. "It is the *mind* that makes the *man*."

This *is* the first commandment. 31 And the second *is* like, *namely* this, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thy- [f] Lev. 19, 18.
Mat. 22. 39. Rom. 13. 9.

---

There is an etymological connection between the two English words. In Sanscrit the verb *man* means *to think*: and thus, '*Man*' *is impersonated* '*mind*.' *Man* is the being on earth who can see *meanings* in things. And it is hence his duty to draw out of this faculty a constant succession of materials, with which to feed his love to God.—It is worthy of observation that the expression, *out of thy whole mind*, has nothing corresponding to it in Deut. vi, 5. There is no antagonism, however, between the two representations. The superadded clause, as Calvin remarks, "does not alter the sense." It is merely the explicit specification of a part of what is latently comprehended in the words *heart* and *soul*.———*And out of thy whole strength*:—For man has *strength*, or *ability*,—the gift of God. Our responsibility is measured by it. Our whole inner being is *Force* or *Energy*, just as it is *Heart*, *Soul*, *Mind*. There is quadruplicity, as well as triplicity, in our nature. There are indeed manifold multiplicities. ———Such is the "first" of the commandments, in the order of importance. Obedience to it would turn our earth into a paradise. The striving toward it —consciously or unconsciously—is the secret of all the civilization that has hitherto been realized.———*This is the first commandment*: This expression,—formally setting on its own pedestal the commandment quoted, is wanting in both the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts (8B), as also in EL$\Delta$, and in the Sahidic and Coptic versions. Tischendorf has withdrawn it from the text, as having been, as he conceives, imported from Matthew xxii, 38. Meyer agrees with him. So does Alford. The matter is of no exegetical moment; though it is not improbable that Tischendorf is right. See next verse.

VER. 31. *And*: Lachmann brackets this conjunction. Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Alford omit it altogether, under the sanction of 8BL$\Delta$. It is a matter of no exegetical moment.———*The second is like, (namely) this*: A clause that exists under a great variety of forms in the manuscripts, - indicating apparently that it had been modified by transcribers out of some brief original phrase. It would seem to have been modified into harmony with the phraseology of Matthew xxii, 39. Tischendorf and Alford read simply and compendiously thus, *The second, this*,—the Vatican reading, and found also in L$\Delta$, and in the Sahidic and Coptic versions. The Sinaitic reading corresponds,—*The second is this*. Meyer approves of Tischendorf's judgement.———*Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself*: *Thy neighbour*. Thy neighbours. It is just the circumference of the duty, whose centre is represented in the preceding commandment. Whosoever really loves God supremely is emancipated from selfishness; and whenever this emancipation takes place, the unselfish spirit goes out with its love to all kindred spirits around. In imperfect man, indeed, sometimes the Godward tendency overweighs too much the manward; and sometimes, on the other hand, it is the philanthropic tendency that is 'loaded.' But the two tendencies are not in antagonism. They are complementive, the one of the other. And when either is clear and pure, it involves the other. Let a man love the Father unselfishly, and not merely as an Almighty Servant, and assuredly, when freely and fully developed, he will love, also unselfishly, the Father's

self. There is none other commandment greater than these. 32 And the scribe said unto him, Well, Master, thou hast said the truth: for there is one God; and [j] there is none other but he: 33 and to love him with all the heart, and with all the understanding, and with all

[j] Deut. 4. 39. Isa. 45. 5. Isa. 46. 9.

---

family. Let a man, on the other hand, love the divine family unselfishly, and he, too, when freely and fully developed, will assuredly rise in his affection to the divine Father.———*There is none other commandment greater than these*:–All other commandments are binding just in proportion as they partake of the essence of these.

Ver. 32. *And the scribe said to him, Well*:–"This includes," says Petter, "a general commendation of our Saviour's answer." The word is not to be connected, as by Luther, Bengel, Coverdale, Principal Campbell, Norton, Webster-and-Wilkinson, with the following verb *thou hast said*. It is in itself, as the Syriac-Peshito translator saw, a condensed sentence, self-contained, and assuming the form of an exclamation, *Well!* or *Right!* or *Admirably!* Literally *Beautifully!*–corresponding to the German *Schön*, which is Ewald's word. The recent Dutch translators have seized the correct idea, setting the term by itself, and rendering it *Juist*. So too Zinzendorf.———*Master*:–Or, as Wycliffe has it, *Maister*. Literally *Teacher*, that is *Rabbi*, as it is in the Peshito-Syriac.———*Thou hast said the truth*:–Not quite an accurate translation. It should be *Thou hast said truly*, viz. what follows.–*Truly*:–Literally *upon truth* (ἐπ' ἀληθείας), that is, *upon truth as a foundation*. The scribe recognized and acknowledged that what our Lord had said was founded *upon truth*.———*For*:–Also an incorrect translation. The conjunction (ὅτι) has here its demonstrative import, *that*, and introduces what it was that our Lord had said truly. So the Peshito-Syriac, Erasmus, Calvin, Zinzendorf, Ewald, Meyer, Bisping, Lange.———*That there is one God*:–Or rather, *That he is one*. The word *God* is wanting in a great preponderance of the best manuscripts, ℵABKLMSUVXΓΔΠ, 1, 33, as well as in the Syriac-Peshito, Gothic, and Æthiopic versions. It is omitted from the text by Bengel, Griesbach, Matthaei, Fritzsche, Scholz, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford. It must be spurious,—so that the subject of the preposition has to be mentally supplied. The scribe's mind was full of the idea of *God*, so that it seemed to him to be enough that he should speak *of Him*, without expressly *naming Him*.———*And there is not another besides him*:–With this clause the scribe *insensibly* moves off from the attitude of a mere reporter of what our Saviour had 'truly said,' and begins to express independently his own ideas. *There is not another 'God.'* Such is the idea. The great monotheistic truth had taken a strong hold of his mind.

Ver. 33. *And to love him out of the whole heart, and out of the whole understanding*: *Understanding* (συνέσεως),—a different word from that employed in verse 30, but having a corresponding import. It properly means *an act of understanding*, but is here freely and indefinitely used to denote the mind as characterized by such acts. So Grimm. The word is finely significant, etymologically considered. It denotes that act by which the mind *sends out its thought to get into company with an object*. When subject and object are

the soul, and with all the strength, and to love *his* neighbour as himself, is [k]more than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices. 34 And when Jesus saw that he answered discreetly, he said unto him, Thou art not far from the kingdom of God. And no man after that [l]durst ask him *any question*.

[k] 1 Sam. 15. 22. Hos. 6. 6. Mic. 6. 6-8. Mat. 9. 13.

[l] Mat. 22. 46.

---

joined, an act of understanding is accomplished. The English word *understanding* goes still farther in its significance. It represents that act in which the 'thought' not only associates itself with the 'thing,' but goes to its bottom, and gets under it,—*stands-under* it.———*And out of the whole soul, and out of the whole strength*:-The former clause is wanting in ℵBLΔ, 1, and in the Coptic and Armenian versions. Tischendorf omits it. It is not unlikely that the scribe confined himself to a triplicity of representation, corresponding to the Hebrew original in Deut. vi. 5, and may thus have used the word *understanding* as substantially equivalent to *soul*.———*And to love his neighbour as himself*: Literally, and as Wycliffe gives it, *and to love the neighebore as him silf*, that is, *and to love one's neighbour as one's self*.———*Is more* (πλεῖον):-In the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts, and "the queen of the cursives," a stronger word is employed, *much more*, (περισσότερον). In both representations the idea of quantity is carried into the idea of quality. All that is really meant, however, by the quantification, is the idea of *superiority*.———*Than all whole-burnt-offerings and sacrifices*:-More literally, *Than all the whole-burnt-offerings and the sacrifices*, that is, *than all the holocausts* (in particular), *and the sacrifices* (in general), *that are offered upon the altar, in accordance with the prescriptions of the ritual law*. The scribe's mind had got a glimpse of the significance of things, and thus of the supremacy of the moral over the ceremonial.

Ver. 34. *And when Jesus saw that he answered discreetly*:-The original form of the expression is exceedingly inartificial, *And Jesus, when he saw him, that he answered discreetly*. The inartificiality proved a stumblingblock to some of the early transcribers; and hence the *him* is omitted in the Sinaitic and Cambridge manuscripts, as also in LΔ. Unnecessarily.—*Discreetly*:-*Sensibly, intelligently*. Wycliffe has *wysely*.—*Answered*: No question had been asked; but the scribe's remark was responsive to our Saviour's statement. It was an echo of the truth.———*He said to him, Thou art not far from the kingdom of God*: The *kingdom of God* is, for the moment, pictorially represented as *localized*, like the ordinary kingdoms of the world. The scribe, walking in the way of conscientious inquiry, and thus making religious pilgrimage, had nearly reached its borderland. He was bordering on the great reality of true religion,—*subjection of spirit to the sovereign will of God*. The kingdom of God is the community of those who bow to the sceptre of God. In the plane of earth it is realized in an incipient stage. In the plane of heaven it is perfected.———*And no man after that*:-No one thenceforward.———*Dared to question him*:-Viz. in a captious or argumentative way. Every man, in the immense surrounding crowd, felt that there was such a reach of insight in the Lord, that it was in vain to dispute with him.

Verses 35—37 form a little appended paragraph, corresponding to Matthew xxii, 41—45, and Luke xx, 41—44.

35 And Jesus answered and said, while he taught in the temple, [m]How say the scribes that Christ is the [n]son of David? 36 For David himself said [o]by the Holy Ghost, [p]The Lord said to my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies

[m] Mat. 22. 41. L. the 20. 41.
[n] Mat. 1. 1. Rom. 1. 3.
[o] 2 Sam. 23. 2. Acts 2. 30. 2 Tim. 3. 16.
[p] Psa. 120. 1.

---

Ver. 35. *And Jesus answered and said*:–Though no question was proposed to him, yet there were many ideas in the minds of his opponents, and of the people in general, which seemed to challenge remark.———*While teaching in the temple*:–While he continued his teaching in the area of the temple.———*How say the scribes*:–*How?*—on what principle of consistency is it that they make the representation?———*That Christ is the son of David*:–Or rather, *that 'the' Christ is David's son.* When the scribes spoke to the people of the promised Messiah, they were accustomed to represent him as *David's son.* It was a true representation. (See Matt. i, 1; Luke iii, 31; Rom. i, 3; Rev. xxii, 16.) And he was to mount David's long-vacated throne, and to render it more illustrious than ever. (See Acts ii, 30.) It was a truth. But nevertheless,—as apprehended by the scribes,—it was only a half-truth.

Ver. 36. *For*:–This conjunction is wanting in the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts, and LT[d]Δ, 69. Tischendorf and Alford leave it out. It is perhaps easier to conceive of its addition to the original text, than of its subtraction.———*David himself said by the Holy Spirit*:–Or, more literally, *'in' the Holy Spirit.* The Holy Spirit is represented as *comprehending* the royal psalmist, and thus interpenetrating his being.———*The Lord said to my Lord*: A quotation from a Psalm—ex which cannot be explained, except on the principle that it is *Messianic* on the one hand, and *inspired* on the other. (See Reinke's *Messianische Psalmen*, ii, p. 151, ff.) Even Strauss is unable to deny that "the majority of ancient Jewish interpreters apply the Psalm to the Messiah." (*Leben Jesu*, ii, 6, 79.)—*The Lord said*:–In Hebrew, *Jehovah said.*—*To my Lord*:–That is, *to my Superior* or *Sovereign.* When King David thus spoke, he had been anticipatively rapt into the far-future, where he saw scenes, and heard words, which would, no doubt, occupy him long in "searching what and what manner of time," and what and what manner of event, "the Spirit of Christ, which was in him, did signify" (1 Pet. i, 11). He was gazing,—though most likely he knew it not,—on a scene that was consequent on the death, burial, and resurrection of his Illustrious Descendant. The scene is laid in Heaven, and its chronology, when sacred history holds up its torch that we may see,—is coincident with the triumphal ascension of our Lord. While David gazed on the Royal Personage, whom Jehovah welcomed to his side, he forgot his own little royalty, and spoke as the humblest seer that ever lived might have spoken,—"Jehovah said to *my Lord.*"———*Sit thou*:–There is no *thou* in the Greek or Hebrew, for there is no emphasis intended to distinguish the person addressed from other persons. The emphasis has reference to the place of honour, to which the person is invited. There is more dignity in the omission, than in the insertion of the pronoun.———*On my right hand*:–That is, *On the place at my right hand.* It is better, however, to merge the *on* altogether, and substitute some other preposition,—*Sit at*

thy footstool. 37 David therefore himself calleth him Lord; and whence is he *then* his son? And the common people heard him gladly.

---

*my right hand*. *At* is nearer the import of the Hebrew, than *on*: and the expression in Greek is *'from' my right hand*, which separates the space to be occupied *from* the person of the speaker.—*My right hand*:—There is no word for *hand* in either the Greek or the Hebrew. The phrase in Greek is plural, *my right (parts)*. Wycliffe has it, *my right half*. The place at the right side of a monarch was the place of highest honour, under himself. In vision, David saw the Monarch of the universe pointing *to the place at his right side*: and he heard Him welcoming to that place, as to a second throne, a glorious personage, who had just entered. This personage David calls "my Lord."———*Till I make thine enemies thy footstool*:—Note the "I." Jehovah is Himself to act. His hand is to be supreme in all the arrangements that are to be conditioned on the accomplished work of the Messiah. Note the expression "thine enemies." It touches a sad reality. Christ *has enemies*, —the enemies of Christianity, of Christliness, of God, of Man. Note the vividly pictorial expression "thy footstool." It is borrowed from the customs of a remote antiquity, when men were fierce and rude, and required extremely striking symbols of ideas for their instruction. In such a state of society, the necessity of submission to rightful authority, and thus to right and righteousness, would be emphatically taught by compelling some of the ringleaders of anarchy and wrong, to act as "foot-stools" to the representatives of legitimate order and law.

VER. 37. *David therefore himself calleth him Lord*:—The *therefore* is wanting in the Sinaitic, Vatican, and Cambridge manuscripts, (ℵBD), as also in LTᵈΔ, and in the Sahidic and Coptic versions. Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford leave it out. Like the *for* in the preceding verse, it is more likely to have been added by some early transcriber than subtracted. He would, no doubt, be imagining that he was doing no harm in smoothing out, or filling up, the abrupt phraseology of the original.———*And whence is he his son?*—The *whence* is logical. *How comes it to pass that he is his son?* The Saviour would not put the question merely to corner up, and puzzle, or humiliate. He had no love for dialectic feats on the "diamond-cut-diamond" principle. His life was too earnest for that. His spirit would be moved with emotion, when he saw how persistently the most learned men of the nation, the accredited interpreters of the sacred writings, skimmed the surface of things, and refused to turn for a moment in the direction of anything different from the most superficial conceits. Hence his question. With their view of the Messiah, as a mere monarch somewhat like David, and in the line of David, it was not wonderful that the scribes did not find anything in Jesus to elicit the echoes of their hopes. They found much that was inconsistent with their fondly cherished anticipations. It was enough for them. They concluded off-hand that it was absurd to suppose that he could be the Being to whom the fathers had pointed. They were not in quest of the divine. They were off the scent entirely, and hence off the track that would have led them to the recognition in our Lord of the fulfilment of the promises made to the Fathers. No view of the Messiah could

38 And he said unto them in his [q]doctrine, [r]Beware of the scribes, which love to go in long clothing,

[q] Chap. 4. 2.
[r] Mat. 23. 1. Luke 20. 46.

be a true view, that did not take into account that there would be such a complement of elements, in his glorious personality, as would constitute him at once *David's son* and *David's Lord.*———*And the common people*:–Not quite a correct translation. There is no antithesis intended to the higher classes of society, (as might be supposed to be the case in *Plutarch, Opera*, i, p. 34. Fr. The expression is literally *the many crowd* (ὁ πολὺς ὄχλος), and means, not as Webster-and-Wilkinson interpret it, *the greater part of the crowd*, but *the numerous crowd, the great crowd.* Young and Alford render it, *the great multitude.* Wakefield, *the multitude, which was great.* Compare Acts xxvi, 24. The expression, without the article, occurs repeatedly in Mark, *a great crowd.* See chap. iv, 1; v, 21, 24; vi, 34; ix, 14; xiv, 43. Here the greatness of the crowd is historically assumed, and it is pictorially referred to in one of those graphic touches, so frequent in Mark, which bewray the hand or tongue of an eye-witness.———*Heard him gladly.* Literally *sweetly*, that is, *with keen relish, with delight.* The masterliness of the reasoning would tell. The power of the speaking would tell. The transparent elevation and earnestness of the character would tell. And, overarching all, there would be a certain indescribable grandeur of spirit, which would make them feel exalted, as toward God and heaven, in the very act of hearing.

Verses 38–40 constitute a condensed paragraph, parallel to Luke xx, 46, 47. It exhibits in a few touches the sum and substance of what is detailed at length in the 23rd chapter of Matthew.

Ver. 38. *And he said to them*:–That is, to the great crowd. But in the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts, and LΔ, the expression *to them* is wanting. The fact that it is introduced in a variety of positions, in the manuscripts which contain it, favours the idea, that it had been originally added in the margin. So Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford.———*In his doctrine*: Or better, *in his teaching.* See chaps. i, 22, 27; iv, 2; xi, 18.———*Beware of the scribes*:–Be *on your guard* in reference to them. Literally, *Look from* them. Look for a way of escape from the onset of their influence. Compare chapter viii, 15. The *scribes* were the learned class in Jewish society. But they seem to have, in general, used their knowledge of letters for purposes that were far from being noble. They were puffed up with conceit, and turned their intellectual advantages into an instrument for feeding an insatiable appetite of selfishness. See on chap. i, 22.———*Who love to go in long clothing*:–The word translated *love* (θελόντων), is so rendered only in this passage. It is commonly translated *will*, and generally denotes either *wish*, or *wish-and-will.* The scribes, *wished-and-willed* to walk in long clothing. It was *their pleasure* thus to walk. They *took pleasure* in the display. Brameld omits the translation of the word altogether. Alford renders it *desire*: Newcome, *like*; Mace, *affect*,—and so too Wakefield, Prin. Campbell, Ro. Dickinson, Edgar Taylor, Young.—*To walk*:–*To walk-about*, to promenade, showing themselves off in the chief places of concourse.—*In long clothing*:–Literally, *in stoles*, long robes reaching to the feet, such as ladies of rank were accustomed to wear, and kings, and nobles, and certain priests, and other high personages.———*And (love) salutations*:–

and *love* salutations in the marketplaces, 39 and [s]the chief seats in the synagogues, and the uppermost rooms at feasts: 40 which devour widows' houses, and [t]for

[s] Luke 11. 43.

[t] Mat. 23. 27. 1 Tim. 2. 8.

Deferential greetings. It gratified them to be called *Rabbi*, and to see the people bowing before them in obeisance. The verb that governs the expression *to walk in long robes*, has to be carried on to govern the word *salutations*. They *wished-and-willed* (to receive) salutations.———*In the market-places*: The places of popular resort, where the people promenaded, and where consequently stalls were erected for the sale of fruits, confections, articles of ornamentation, &c. Our British market-places do not quite correspond.

VER. 39. *And the chief seats*:—There is no article in the original, *and prominent seats*. Literally, *and first seats*, or *front seats*. Wycliffe has it, *the firste chaires*.———*In the synagogues*: They carried their vanity even into the places of worship.———*And uppermost rooms at the feasts*. Literally, *in the suppers*,—the fashionable entertainments to which they were invited. To modern ears the expression *uppermost rooms*, if detached from its context, would convey a totally different idea from what is meant in the passage before us. It has no reference to *apartments in upper stories*, but simply to *the places of honour at the supper-table*. The place occupied by an individual was his *room*. And, as the host was regarded as occupying *the head*, or *upper part of the table*, the places near him were the *uppermost rooms*. Wycliffe's translation is, *the firste sittinge places*. The original expression means, *first reclining-places*.

VER. 40. *Who devour widows' houses*:—Our translators had regarded this clause as a continuative addition to the preceding clauses. So too Luther, Beza, Erasmus Schmid, Sebastian Schmidt, Le Clerc, Heumann, Alford, and English translators in general. There is, however, a change in the construction. The nominative is used in place of the genitive. This change *might* be accounted for on a principle of unconscious transition. But it is better to suppose a pause at the conclusion of the 39th verse. Then our Saviour resumes, and makes a self-contained sentence of this 40th verse, *They who devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayers, these shall receive greater damnation*. There is more spirit in this method of construction. And though the reference to the scribes, or to some prominent individuals among them, is merged in a more generic statement, yet the undercurrent of allusion is evident. This self-contained construction is approved of by Grotius, Felbinger, Bengel, Zinzendorf, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Meyer, Bisping, Lange.———*They who devour the houses of the widows*: It is a vivid hieroglyph. What an extraordinary 'swallow' the devourers must have had! The very idea of it, apparently, either shocked Principal Campbell, or failed to effect an entrance into his conception, and hence he renders the phrase *the families of widows*,—a most unhappy emendation. It was not their families that the scribes coveted, but *the literal houses*. Having, as the lettered class, to do almost all the writing that required to be done, they would be universally employed in making wills, and conveyances of property. In some notorious cases, perhaps in many,—they had been abusing their influence with widows.———*And for a pretence make long prayers*:—*And in pretence pray long*. They did not really pray. They did not open up their hearts to God, and

a pretence make long prayers: these shall receive greater damnation.

41 [1]And Jesus sat over against the treasury, and [1] Luke 21. 1.
beheld how the people cast [2]money into the trea- [2] *A piece of brass money.* See Mat. 10. 9.

---

thence lift up their desires. They merely pretended to pray. And that they might succeed the more effectually in the imposition, they continued long at the 'exercise.' The base hypocrites! It was to impose on the widows, or to minister in other ways to selfish aims, that the prayers were lengthened out. ———*These*:–This resumptive word indicates a peculiar edge of feeling on the Saviour's spirit.———*Shall receive greater damnation*:–It is *judgement* (κρίμα) in the original. And so the Rheims. Wycliffe's word is *doom*, or *dom* as he spells it. It means properly *judicial sentence*, and then, as here, *the award objectively specified in the sentence*. It is assumed that the judicial sentence would be condemnatory.—*Greater*:–The word is rendered *more abundant* in 1 Cor. xii, 23. Principal Campbell renders the whole phrase, freely, *the severest punishment.*

Verses 41—44 constitute a paragraph, which has no parallel in Matthew. There is, however, a corresponding paragraph in Luke xxi, 1—4.

Ver. 41. *And Jesus sat*:–Or, as it is in the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts, *and he sat.*———*Over against the treasury*:–In that great central quadrangle or court of the temple, that was accessible to the Jewish women. It lay in front of the Sanctuary, "forming," says Thrupp, "a kind of ante-court to the rest of the Inner Temple" (*Jerusalem*, p. 329). It was environed, on the three remaining sides, by the vast spaces of the court of the Gentiles. In a certain portion of this spacious quadrangle was *the treasury*, (compare John viii, 20 and Josephus, *Ant.* xix, 6, 1), where, as we are informed in the Talmud, there were thirteen receptacles for receiving certain religious dues, and the people's free-will offerings for the benefit of the temple. These receptacles were called *Shopheroth*, or *Trumpets*, because they were trumpet-shaped,—swelling out beneath, and tapering upward into a narrow mouth or opening, into which the contributions were put. (*Buxtorf's Lexicon Talmud.* p. 2506.) Each receptacle had a label upon it which specified the particular object, or charity, to which it was reserved. (*Lightfoot's Prospect of the Temple*, chap. xix.). It was over against the place where those treasury-receptacles were arranged that our Saviour sat, in the covered piazza, or colonnade, toward the right hand on going toward the Sanctuary. (See *Vogüé's Temple*, pl. xv.)———*And beheld*:–*And he was beholding.* He was deliberately observing, as one who had a right to take note of the moral acts of the people.———*How the people*:–Or rather, *How the crowd of people* (ὁ ὄχλος). The Rheims has, *the multitude*. Note the *how*. It is more primitive and expressive than such a semi-demonstrative phrase as *how that*. The Saviour noticed, not merely the fact or acts of contribution, but also the wonderfully diversified modes in which the acts exhibited themselves. Mode is inseparable from act, and, when outward, reveals the inward essence of the act. We may suppose that our Saviour *looked in*, through the diversified modes that struck his outward eye, *to the diversified characters of the contributors*, as they passed in succession before him. If so, it would be with

sury: and many that were rich cast in much. 42 And there came a certain poor widow, and she threw in two

far more interest and innerliness, than was ever manifested by Lavater, and with an intuition that was unerring. "On Sundays, after the sermon," says the poet Goethe, "it was Lavater's duty, as an ecclesiastic, to hold the short-"handled, velvet, alms-bag before each one who went out, and to bless as he "received the pious gift. Now, on a certain Sunday he proposed to himself, "without looking at the several persons as they dropped in their offerings, to "observe only their hands, and by them silently to judge of the forms of their "donors. Not only the shape of the finger, but its peculiar action in dropping "the gift, was attentively noted by him, and he had much to communicate "to me on the conclusions he had formed." (*Autobiography*, vol. ii, B. xix, p. 137.) As the idiosyncracy and form of the whole body were revealed to Lavater's eye, by the form and action of the fingers; so the idiosyncracy and moral condition of every soul were unveiled to our Saviour's gaze, as he noticed '*how*' the offerings were cast in.———*Cast money into the treasury*:-The word *cast* is ambiguous in English, so far as tense is concerned. But the verb in the original is in the present, *are casting*. The evangelist, as so often on other occasions, goes back in thought to the scene, and looks at the acts of contribution. The crowd-of-people are casting in *money*:—literally, *copper* (χαλκόν); and so, no doubt, the word should have been translated. Compare Matt. x, 9. The great bulk of the people, then as now, would contribute just *copper*. But it should be borne in mind by modern contributors that the relative value of *copper* was much greater then than now. What Trapp so cynically says will surely not be always true,—"Something men will do, but as little as they can."———*And many rich were casting in much*:-An expression that may mislead, for the word *much* is a free translation. It is literally *many (pieces)*. Perhaps some might be giving silver or gold. But it is likely that the great majority of even the rich would be contenting themselves with giving *a considerable quantity of the current copper coins*, "a handful of halfpence" as it were, according to the suggestion of Dr. Adam Clarke.—*Many pieces*:-Even at the present day a European, when travelling in Palestine, is amazed at the multitude of little pieces which he receives in exchange for silver or gold.

VER. 42. *And there came a certain poor widow*:-Or, literally, *one poor widow*, or as Wycliffe gives it, *o pore widowe*. The evangelist singles her out.——— *And she threw in two mites, which make a farthing*:-An admirable translation, when the words *mites* and *farthing* are considered etymologically. *Farthing* is just a corrupt way of saying *fourthing* or *fourthling*, Anglo-Saxon *feorthling*; and thus it denotes *the fourth part* of some standard coin or sum. And this is the precise idea of the term employed by the evangelist, (κοδράντης=*quadrans*). In English a *farthing* is the fourth part of a "penny." In Latin a *quadrans* or *quadrant* was the fourth part of an "as." But the coinage of the Hebrews, under the Romans, was so exceedingly mixed, that it may be difficult to determine what proportion of a Greek *drachm*, or Latin *denarius*, was represented by their *quadrant*. (See Beza, De Dieu, and Fischer).—The word *mite* has come to us, apparently, as a contraction of the word *minúte* (Latin *minûtum*). As a *minute* of time, is just a *minúte* portion of time, so a *minute*

[3] mites, which make a [g]farthing. 43 And he called *unto him* his disciples, and saith unto them, Verily I say unto you, [v]That this poor widow hath cast more in, than all they which have cast into the treasury: 44 for all *they* did cast in of their abundance; but she of her want did cast in all that she had, *even* all her living.

[3] It is the seventh part of one piece of that brass money.

[v] Mat. 5. 26.

[w] 2 Cor. 8. 2. 2 Co. 8. 12.

## CHAPTER XIII.

*Jesus predicts the destruction of the Jewish temple, 1, 2. His disciples ask him "when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign when all these things shall be fulfilled?" 3, 4. Jesus, in answering, takes occasion to lift up before their view, now at this point, and now at that, the veil that hides the nearer and remoter future from human gaze. He directs their attention to some things that would transpire ere very long, and to others*

---

or *mite* of money is just *a minute coin*. Wycliffe has here *twei nymetis*, that is, *two minutes*. The Greek word (λεπτά) denotes *thin (pieces.)*

VER. 43. *And he called to him his disciples, and said to them*:—It is *said*, instead of *saith*, in a great majority of the best manuscripts.——*Verily I say to you, This poor widow cast in more*:—Not *hath cast in more*, but *cast in more*, according to the aoristic reading of Lachmann and Tregelles. It is supported by ABDLΔ, 33, and substantially by the Sinaitic also.——*Than all they who are casting into the treasury*:—Such is undoubtedly the correct reading. It is supported by ℵABDLXΓΔΠ, and accepted into the text by all the modern critical editors. The Saviour does not wait till the stream of contributors has flowed past. While it is still flowing, he makes an unerring comparison, and utters his commendation of the poor 'lorn' woman. She *gave* more than all the rest *are giving*. Note the word *more*,—proportionally, to wit, to her means, and thus *more* in the estimation of God, who measures quantity by quality.

VER. 44. *For all did cast in*:—We might have expected that it would have been said, *For all are casting in*. And such no doubt was, in substance, the meaning of our Lord,—only he chooses to vary his standpoint of observation, and to specify those alone of the continuous stream of contributors, who had already thrown in their offerings.——*Out of their abundance*:—Their *surplusage* as it were, or, as Tyndale and Coverdale have it, *their superfluite*. He, whose eye could see, had taken note. (John xxi, 17.)——*But she out of her penury*:—Out of that condition, in which *she came behind her neighbours*. She had no superfluity.——*Did cast in all that she had, her whole living*:—Her whole *means of living*,—every particle of money that she had in the world. He, who "knew all things," knew. And his simple notification of the fact, and true appraisement of the quantity involved in the quality of the offering, have touched the hearts of generations of admirers. The collective voice of all the ages of the Christian era has been this,—'*O woman, great was thy munificence! Great was thy faith.*'

*that would come to pass only at a far distant period. He cautions them against impostors, and warns them not to be hasty in concluding that "the end" was imminent. He reminds them that they would have many sufferings to endure, and much work to accomplish, and that Jerusalem, the Jews, and nations in general, would require to pass through a scathing furnace of trial. It would be well, however, in the end of the ends, with the righteous. Meanwhile, what he said to one, he would say to all, 'Watch,' 5—37.*

"AND as he went out of the temple, one of his [a]disciples saith unto him, Master, see what manner [a]Mat. 24. 1. Luke 21. 5.
of stones and what buildings *are here!* 2 And Jesus answer-

## CHAPTER XIII.

THIS chapter of 'eschatology' corresponds to Matthew xxiv, and Luke xxi, 5—36. The end of our Saviour's terrestrial career was at hand. He knew it well. Its imminency led him to improve to the utmost the limited opportunities, which were still available for enlightening, forewarning, and thus fore-arming, the minds of his disciples. In this chapter he sheds light upon certain 'coming events' of great significance and moment. They were partly in the more remote, and partly in the nearer, future. All men have prophetic longings, and look, instinctively, more or less forward. But if a man's soul be lofty, he looks far forward.

VER. 1. *And as he went out of the temple*:—*Went*, or rather *was going*. What follows occurred while he was in the act of going out of the temple.———*One of his disciples says to him, Master*:—Literally, *Teacher*. The actual word employed would no doubt be the Hebrew title, *Rabbi*. See chap. ix, 5; xi, 21; xiv, 45.———*See what manner of stones and what buildings are here*:—Or, more simply and concisely, *See! what stones! and what buildings!* The great size of the blocks, and the massiveness and magnificence of the erections, the colonnades or porticos, gateways, and other structures, that were grouped around the Inner Sanctuary, riveted the disciple's attention, and evoked his admiration. No wonder. The temple of Jerusalem was one of the wonders of the world. Whosoever had not seen it, said the old rabbis, had not seen the Perfection of architectural beauty. (See Wetstein, vol. i, p. 493.) Josephus, in his *Antiquities*, xv, 11, 3, speaks of the stones of a certain part of the edifice, as being "each, in length twenty-five cubits, in height eight, in breadth about twelve." In his *Wars*, v, 5, 6, he speaks of "some of the stones as forty-five cubits in length, five in height, and six in breadth." Stones these, of a magnitude almost baffling to the imagination of those who have not travelled in the east. They have their analogues only in some of our greatest, but unchiselled, 'megaliths.'

VER. 2. *And Jesus, answering, said to him*:—The *answering* is omitted in the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts (ℵB), and 33 "the queen of the cursives."

ing said unto him, Seest thou these great buildings? There shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down.

3 And as he sat upon the mount of Olives over against the temple, Peter and James and John and Andrew asked him

---

Tischendorf and Tregelles leave it out.———*Seest thou these great buildings?*-Mace, Worsley, Principal Campbell, and Godwin give the words affirmatively, —*Thou seest these great buildings.* There is probably a touch of both the modes of representation, or a hovering between the two,—*Thou seest—dost thou?—these great buildings.* The verb translated *seest* (βλέπει) means *beholdest*, and here suggests an idea akin to *contemplatest*. Norton's rendering is too strong however, *are you gazing on?*———*There shall not be left one stone upon another*:-Literally, *stone upon stone*, or, as with our English indefinite article, we might express it, *a stone upon a stone.* That is Wycliffe's version, *a stoon upon a stoon.* ———*Which shall not be thrown down*:-Very literally, *which shall not be loosened down.* A progressive process is depicted. Demolition proceeds, and is nearly completed. Still here and there *a stone is left upon a stone.* But the demolition advances till it is consummated. *Every stone that had been left lying on a stone, is detached and thrown down.* Aye; it is not the Jewish temple that is to be eternal. "The words have emphasis," says Zuingli. They have: and they have been fulfilled to the letter,—so far as the area of the temple-platform is concerned. The substructures of the surrounding walls,—some of which still stand,—would not be referred to. The disciple was not pointing to them, or looking at them. "It is a figurative speech," says Petter. It is enough to take it as such. And then the figure is a fine instance of natural hyperbole, bold, and grandly graphic. None but a paltering mind could be stumbled at it, or have difficulty in interpreting it. Compare chap. x, 25. (As to the aorist subjunctive with the double negative, see Clyde's *Greek Syntax*, pp. 93, 115.)

Ver. 3. The conversation would probably cease for a little. But the company solemnly proceeded; and by and by Mount Olivet was reached. The ascent began,—in silent meditation, we may suppose. The Saviour is in advance. At some convenient spot he pauses, and, turning his face toward the beloved but faithless city, he seats himself. *And as he sat*: Or, *And as he was sitting,—while he was sitting.*———*Upon the Mount of Olives*:-Very literally, *to the Mount of the olives.* The motion of the person *to* the Mount, ere rest was obtained *on* it, is primitively suggested.———*Over against the temple*:-Thus looking westward, —as the façade of the temple faced the east. The temple, with its surrounding perspectives, as seen from the Mount of Olives, must have been one of the grandest terrestrial sights on which the eye of man could rest.———*Peter and James and John and Andrew*:-It is noteworthy that the sons of Zebedee come, in the enumeration, between Peter and his brother Andrew. Spiritual relationship over-rides the physical. It is noteworthy also that James takes, as usual, precedence of John,—no doubt because he was the older of the two. It was only gradually that John's intrinsic pre-eminence asserted itself,—though to the Saviour himself he seemed to get nearer than his brother.———*Asked him privately*:-Or, *aside*, as the expression is sometimes rendered. See Mark vii, 33; Luke ix, 10. It is also frequently rendered *apart*. See Matt. xiv, 13, 23;

privately, 4 Tell us, when shall these things be? and what *shall be* the sign when all these things shall be fulfilled?

5 And Jesus, answering them, began to say, [b]Take [b] Eph. 5. 6. 2 Thes. 2. 3.

xvii, 1, &c.: and so it is rendered here in the Rheims. The excluding reference of the expression is not likely to have relation to the other disciples, (see Matt. xxiv, 3; Luke xxi, 7), but to the people in general, who might be hovering about, outside their little circle. No doubt there would be many, attracted by the presence of our Lord, who would feel loath to lose sight of him. They would be straggled around and behind, individually, and in groups, waiting on, respectfully or wistfully, in the hope of getting access to listen. The Saviour, however, wished to be alone with his disciples for a season. His wish would be understood, and strangers would retire or keep at a distance.

VER. 4. *Tell us, when shall these things be?*—The *things*, namely, that were involved in the total demolition of the Jewish temple. The ideas of the disciples would no doubt be confused. Their notions in reference to the futurities of the kingdom of heaven, would be immature. They would be very imperfectly apprehending the relation of Judaism to Christianity, and of the Jews to the rest of mankind, and of Jesus to peoples in general; and, consequently, the relation of the Jewish temple, the Jewish worship, and Jerusalem, to the dispensation of the fulness of the times. Even still, on some of these points, much confusion of ideas prevails among "the students of prophecy." Lines of discrimination are sometimes too rigidly drawn; and, at other times, they are lost sight of altogether. And no wonder, therefore, that the apostles,—whose minds had been steeped for long in crude Rabbinic conceptions, but who had been beginning to see rays of light struggling in through their darkness,—were unable to work out for themselves a consistent scheme of the future, in its relation to their Lord and his kingdom.——*And what shall be the sign, when all these things are about to be fulfilled?* The same *class of things* are referred to, but their radius gets elongated. Their range expands. And hence, as the disciples think of them, they now say, *all these things*. They wonder when *all these things* '*shall be fulfilled*' (μέλλη συντελεῖσθαι), shall be *finished* (Rom. ix, 28), shall *come to a conclusion*. They do not so much reflect on the commencement and progress, as on the consummation of the dread events. With that consummation they would be connecting, in their ideas, the overturning of all human institutions, the winding up of all the probationary affairs of the world, the great judgement, and thus the glorious epiphany of their Lord to act as Judge of the whole earth, and to inaugurate, with befitting pomp, and all the visible insignia of universal royalty, the Dispensation of the New Heavens and the New Earth. They were eager to know what would be the *sign* or *signal* of this great œcumenic crisis. Their ideas would be indistinct, and very particularly in a chronological point of view; but, as faithful servants of their Lord, they wished to be on their watch-towers,—looking out for the fulfilment of their Messianic hopes.

VER. 5. *And Jesus, answering, began to say to them*:—The word *answering* is wanting in the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts (ℵB), and in 33 "the queen of the cursives," as also in the Syriac-Peshito, Coptic, Sahidic, Armenian versions. It is omitted by Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford.—*Jesus began to say*

heed lest any *man* deceive you. 6 For many shall come in my name, saying, I am *Christ;* and shall deceive many. 7 And when ye shall hear of wars and rumours of wars,

---

*to his disciples* what follows. The evangelist, as often elsewhere, fixes his attention on the *beginnings* of addresses or statements. Comp. chap. i, 45; iv, 1; v, 17, 20; vi, 2, 34; viii, 11, 31, 32; x, 28, 41; xii, 1.———*Take heed lest any man deceive you*:—*Beware lest any one lead you astray.* Be on the outlook not merely heavenward, but earthward. Depend upon it, there will be danger of seduction unless you are wary.

Ver. 6. *For*:—Tischendorf omits this conjunction, under the sanction of the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts; and he remarks that it is a feature of Mark's composition to leave out such connectives. In the case before us, Matthew and Luke, who have their own idiosyncrasies of composition, insert the *for* in their parallel representations. See Matt. xxiv, 5; Luke xxi, 8.———*Many shall come in my name*:—Literally, *on my name*,—founding *on* it. They shall assume the name that belongs to me alone, '*the Messiah*,' '*the Christ*.' On that assumption they will erect an imposing edifice of claims, which, crazy with its own intrinsic unreality, will fall disastrously on all who rally round it. There would, no doubt, be many of these pretenders in the period that elapsed before the destruction of the temple of Jerusalem,—just as there have been many since. They have in general, indeed, been too insignificant to leave their mark in history. But their pretences would be none the less perilous to the little circles of the simple-hearted, who might be within the reach of their influence. Even at the present day there is a sprinkling of strange individuals, dotting society here and there all over the world, who claim to be either Christ come back again, or the Holy Spirit, or some kindred Incarnation. Some of these go at large, and address their fellow-men, or write books and manifestoes, and wield other kinds of influence.———*Saying I am (Christ)*:—There is no word *Christ* in the original, though it is freely supplied, not only in our English Authorized Version, but also in the Coptic, Sahidic, Armenian, Anglo-Saxon versions, and by Erasmus, Luther, Tyndale, Beza. The expression is exceedingly expressive without it, when, as should be the case, the emphasis is laid, not on the '*am*' as in the name of God '*I AM*' (Ex. iii, 14), but on the '*I*.' The egotism of the respective pretenders is graphically exhibited.———*And shall deceive many*: *Shall lead many astray*, more especially, among the ignorant and ingenuous. When such persons cannot be seduced by gross baits of sensualism, they can sometimes be caught in the snares of a wild and lurid enthusiasm.

Ver. 7. *But when ye shall hear of wars, and rumours of wars*:—*Ye*,—the Saviour, as he speaks, is not thinking merely of the twelve individuals, as individuals, who were around him. They were *his disciples*. He was thinking of them *as such*. And in thinking of them *as such*, his field of vision widened. He thought of *his disciples in general*. There were, indeed, '*rumours of wars*' rife enough before the destruction of Jerusalem. The whole Roman empire was uneasy. A far firmer hand than that of the animalised Vitellius,—who lived to eat,—was needed on the imperial throne. The firmest that could be got was not firm enough. Hence the *rumours of*

[c] be ye not troubled: for *such things* must needs be; [c] Psa. 27. 3.
Psa. 46. 1. Pro. 3. 25. John. 14. 1.

*wars*, which agitated the empire. And besides these, there were, to some small extent, actual '*wars*,' which certain students of prophecy have succeeded in hunting up in the byeways of history. But minute and microscopic research is not needed. There have been, since the destruction of Jerusalem, actual '*wars*' innumerable, and '*rumours of wars*' innumerable. All these were embraced within the scope of the Saviour's vision. He was looking to another "end." ——*Be not troubled*:-*Be not alarmed.* Literally, *Do not cry out*, (μὴ θροεῖσθε). Wycliffe, *Drede ye not.* The word occurs only here and in Matt. xxiv. 6, and in Thess. ii. 2. Do not conclude from such occurrences that the pangs of the world's dissolution are imminent. ——*For*: Here too the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts (ℵ*B), and Tischendorf, omit the conjunction. (See on verse 6.) ——*Such things must needs be*: Or, more simply, *they must needs be.* Or still more simply, *they must be. It is necessary that they be.* The adverb *needs* (Anglo-Saxon *neodes*, i.e. *of need* or *of necessity*) only intensifies the idea which is already expressed in the *must*. The idea, however, has no reference to any absolute necessity, or fatality, over-riding and enslaving the wills of men. It does not refer to what Archbishop Bramhall calls "antecedent and extrinsical necessity." Such necessity, as he remarks "destroys liberty, "and dishonours the nature of man. It makes second causes and outward "objects to be the rackets, and men to be but the tennis-balls, of destiny." "Excuse me," he adds, "if I hate this doctrine with a perfect hatred."—"It "were better to be an atheist, to believe no God; or to be a Manichee, to "believe two gods, a god of good, and a god of evil; or, with the heathens, to "believe thirty thousand gods, than thus to charge the true God to be the "proper cause, and the true Author of all the sins and evils which are in the "world." (*Defence of True Liberty*, pp. 60–1.) The necessity referred to is relative to the antecedent elections, or choices of the human will; but, within that sphere, it is real, inevitable, irresistible. If men persist in choosing to be selfish, grasping, haughty, then a Higher Hand comes into operation, and whirlwinds must be reaped. What multitudes of these have already swept across the area of human society! What multitudes more will yet require to do their appointed work as 'besoms of destruction'!——*But the end shall not be yet*: There is no verb in the original, *but not yet the end*,—the great end, the end of the age,—'the present evil age,'—the age that is to run on till all things be made new and glorious. It may be that, in the disciples' ideas, this 'end,' and the end of the temple, would be synchronous. Most likely. The whole subject would be lying in confusion before their view. And the Saviour would see that it would have but ministered to further confusion, had he attempted, by the introduction of niceties of chronology, to rectify into precision their scheme of the futurities. He acted with consummate wisdom. He confined himself to leading lines of processional evolution,—now taking up one, and now another. Instead of scattering attention on matters of minute detail, he contented himself, as was his wont, with summations of particulars, and the enunciation of great general principles. It was ever his leading aim to throw practical seed-thoughts into the minds of his disciples and auditors in general.

but the end *shall* not *be* yet. 8 For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom: and there shall be earthquakes in divers places, and there shall be famines and troubles. These *are* the beginnings of [1]sorrows.

[1] The word in the original importeth *the pains of a woman in travail.*

---

Ver. 8. *For nation shall rise against nation*:—Literally, *upon nation*. One nation shall rise in its anger to come *down upon* another. A kind of gigantic collective personality is ascribed to nations. There will be wars of nationalities. ———*And kingdom upon kingdom*:—Whether they be, as in some cases, the subdivisions of a single nationality, or, as in others, greater communities, or empires, embracing, within one political sphere, various distinct nationalities. Kingdoms will rise up to put down kingdoms; and terrific in their clash will be the collisions. ———*And there shall be*:—The *and* is wanting in ℵBDL, and in the Coptic and Sahidic versions. It is left out by Tischendorf and Tregelles. ———*There shall be earthquakes in divers places*:—For not yet is the earth—which "the meek shall inherit" (Matt. v, 5, Rom. iv, 13, 14)—a fit residence for the glorious community. Neither will it be, so long as there is scope for the incidence of such fearful phenomena as earthquakes. In "the new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness" (2 Pet. iii, 13) there will no longer be anything 'to hurt.' ———*And there shall be famines*:—The *and*, here too, is omitted in the manuscripts ℵBDL, and in the Coptic and Sahidic versions. Tischendorf and Alford leave it out.—*Famines*:—Terrible scourges, when they occur. And, notwithstanding all the resources and appliances of modern commercial inter-relationships, they still do occur. When they happen among a people, who are supplied with only a scanty circulation of the precious metals, the effects are necessarily of the most melancholy description. Witness the state of Persia this very year (1871). If mankind were once a self-realizing brotherhood, famines would be impossible. The scarcity of one region would be readily supplemented out of the abundance of others. ———*And troubles*:—That is, *disturbances*, or *social perplexities and tumults*,—such as are the natural result of widespread 'want.' Men, who are pinched with hunger, are apt, unless of noble character, to become desperate and reckless. In ℵBDL, however, and the Vulgate, Coptic, and Æthiopic versions, the phrase *and troubles* is wanting. Mill approves of the omission (*Prol.* §. 408), and Griesbach (*Com. Crit.*) The phrase is left out of the text by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles. But on insufficient grounds. The omission truncates, as Fritzsche justly observes, the evangelist's phraseology: and the wilful addition of the expression cannot be accounted for, except on some violent hypothesis. Mill supposed that it had been originally a (political) explanation of the word *earthquakes*. Unnatural. Griesbach thought that if the expression had been genuine, it would have come in before, not after, the *earthquakes* and *famines*. He did not notice the natural connection that subsists between the want of the necessaries of life and political perplexity. Origen expressly notes, (*Op.* iii, p. 855), that "Mark adds *and troubles*," (Marcus eadem, addit autem, *et turbelas.*) ———*These are the beginnings of sorrows*:—Literally *of parturition-pangs*. There is hope in the word. The *regeneration* of the world will

9 But take heed to yourselves: for they shall deliver you up to councils; and in the synagogues ye shall be beaten:

---

be the ultimate result. But the anguish that precedes will be inexpressible. The Saviour has but touched on the *beginnings* of that anguish. Its consummation would have been utterly unintelligible to the apostles. It is, we doubt not, all but utterly unintelligible even yet. The greater the complexity of society, the more intricate the interdependency of the various classes, the vaster the accumulation of the results of civilization, the higher the refinement of thought and feeling, so much the more tremendous will be the unutterable woes that must be experienced, when the crisis of universal revolution takes place. Instead of *beginnings*, Matthew has the singular *beginning* (xxiv, 8); and such too is the reading, in this place, of ℵBDKLS*UΔΠ*, and of Lachmann, Scholz, Tischendorf, Tregelles. The plural reading is given in AEFGHMS²VXΓΠ², and it occurs too in the Italic and Vulgate versions of Matthew. The singular reading seems to be the best supported; and yet we can more easily suppose that it was the correction of the plural, than that the plural was the correction of the singular. Exegetically, the variation is of no moment.—In all Beza's editions, with the exception of the first in 1556, the clause, *these are the beginnings of sorrows*, is transferred to the commencement of verse 9. Unhappily. But the Elzevirs followed his example; and hence continental editions in general, inclusive of Bengel's, Lachmann's, Scholz's, and Tischendorf's, exhibit the same awkward arrangement. So too Mill and his followers, and even Alford. But not Calvin, Castellio, Erasmus Schmid, Zinzendorf, Tregelles.

Ver. 9. *But take heed to yourselves*:—*But look ye to yourselves.* The Saviour, after having swept with his eye a vast circumference of society, stretching away downward through time, returns to the disciples that were around him, and addresses them, partly as individuals, and partly as the representatives of such others as might eventually be associated with them. He gives them allowance to be careful of life and limb. He does more, he enjoins them.———*For*:—Their utmost care would be needed, *for* they would be exposed to very ruthless persecution. The *for*, however, is wanting in the Vatican manuscript (B), and in L, as also in the Coptic, Armenian, and Æthiopic versions. Tischendorf has omitted it. But on insufficient grounds.———*They shall deliver you up*:—*They*, the reference is indefinite, corresponding to *on* in French, and *Mann* in German. *You shall be delivered up.*———*To councils, and in synagogues ye shall be beaten*:—It should rather be, *to councils and to synagogues* (καὶ εἰς συναγωγάς); *ye shall be beaten*. This is the most natural interpretation. It is given by Erasmus, Luther, Tyndale, Cardinal Cajetan, Coverdale, Calvin, Castellio, Beza, the Geneva, le Clerc; and also by Heumann, Lachmann, Meyer, Tregelles. And though it is opposed by many, inclusive of Bengel, Bleek, Rilliet, Alford, Klostermann, the opposition rests on insufficient grounds.—The word *councils* or *sanhedrims* denotes such civil, or ecclesiastico-civil, courts, or 'consistories of justice' (*Petter*), as had power to deal with individuals who might be regarded as disturbers of the peace, or dangerous to society. *Synagogues* were assemblies for worship, but possessing, within certain limits, jurisdiction,—jurisdiction that could take effect, not merely on spiritual relationships, but also on the

and ye shall be brought before rulers and kings for my sake, for a testimony against them.

10 And [d]the gospel must first be published among all nations.

[d] Mat. 24. 14. Mat. 28. 19. Rev. 14. 6.

---

outer person. In the word *councils* or *sanhedrims* the reference is conventionally to the persons met in conclave, as distinguished from the literal or topical conclave itself, the meeting-place. The term, however, is sometimes used topically. See Acts iv, 15. Compare Herodotus, viii, 79, and Xenophon *Hist. Gr.* ii, 4, 23. In the word *synagogues*, again, the reference is conventionally rather to the places of assembly, than to the persons assembled. But the term, nevertheless, originally referred to *the persons assembled*, and is so used here in consequence of its connection with *sanhedrims*. It is similarly used in Acts ix, 2 and xiii, 43, as also in Luke xii, 11 (see *Greek*). ——*Ye shall be beaten*:–Literally, *skinned*, that is, *scourged*. The statement stands on its own pedestal. But it may be assumed that, in many cases at least, the torturing infliction would be made in the presence of the Council, or within the walls of the Synagogue. See Matt. x, 17; Acts xxii, 24.—"There "were two ways of scourging; one with thongs or whips; the other with rods "or twigs. The punishment was inflicted on the offender lying on the ground; "Ex. xxi, 20; Lev. xix, 20; Deut. xxii, 18; Prov. x, 13; xiii, 24; xx, 30; xxiii, "13, 14; Ps. lxxxix, 32; 1 Kings xi, 12. In later times the offender was tied "by his arms to a pillar, and his back laid bare to the *virgæ* or rods of the lictor." (Bastow's *Bible Dictionary*, p. 654.)——*And ye shall be brought*:–Or, '*brought up*' as our English idiom goes. Literally, *Ye shall be made to stand*.——*Before rulers and kings*:–The preposition translated *before*, literally means *upon* (ἐπί), *i.e. up on*, and thus, in such a case as this, means *in the elevated presence of*. See Matt. xxviii, 14.—*Rulers*:–Such as Roman *proconsuls, proprætors, procurators*, or other *presidents* or *prefects*.—*Kings*:–Such as Agrippa for instance, and many other monarchs in many parts of the world.——*For my sake*:–*On account of me, because of your loyalty to me*.——*For a testimony to them*:–Not, as Petter and others would have it, *for a testimony against them*. The forcible arrestment of Christ's disciples, and their consequent trial at the bar of the highest terrestrial authorities, would be divinely permitted and over-ruled for this, as for other ends,—to give them an opportunity of bearing testimony to the high and influential classes of society, in reference to the truth, purity, power, and glory of the Gospel.

Ver. 10. *And the gospel must first be published among all nations*:–*First*, before the "end" come,—the "end" spoken of in verse 7,—the end of the age that is to precede the new and glorious epoch.—*Published*:–*Heralded*. The word is generally rendered in our Authorized Version, *preached*, sometimes *proclaimed* (Luke xii, 3; Rev. v, 2). The office of the minister of Christ is heraldic in its nature. It is his duty to make public proclamation of the good news of salvation.—*Among all nations*:–Literally, *to all the nations*. The Gospel has a world-wide destiny, and until that destiny be fulfilled, the "end" will not be.——Köstlin thinks that this 10th verse is ineptly introduced into its present position between verses 9 and 11,—causing an unnatural rupture in the practical instructions contained in these verses. (*Ursprung und Komposition*, p. 352.)

11 [e]But when they shall lead *you*, and deliver you up, take no thought beforehand what ye shall speak, [f]neither do ye premeditate: but whatso- [e] Mat. 10. 19. Luke 12. 11. [f] Luke 21. 14.

---

But a deeper and juster view of the Saviour's aim would have shown that it was of the utmost practical moment that the Lord's apostles, and his other disciples, should bear in mind that, however severe the persecutions to which they might be individually exposed, the great crisis would not be imminent till the Gospel should have fairly fulfilled its world-wide mission.

VER. 11. *But*: Or *And*, as it is in ℵBDL, 33, and in the Vulgate and Coptic versions. It is *But* in the parallel passages,—Matt. x, 19; Luke xii, 11 *(Greek)*. ——*When they shall lead you*: Or rather, *when they may be leading you* (ὅταν ἄγωσιν), viz. in fetters, or, at all events, as persons under arrest. The Saviour transports his disciples, in imagination, to the road, along which they might be forcibly conducted to appear before the civil authorities.——*And deliver you up*:—Or, as Bengel and Principal Campbell render it, *to deliver you up*. It is literally, *delivering up*. The act of *delivering up* is represented as beginning with the act of compulsory *leading*.——*Take no thought beforehand what ye should speak*: The word *thought* is used here,—as in Matt. vi, 25, 27, 28, 31, 34, and Luke xii, 22, 25, 26, and 1 Sam. ix, 5,—as also in other writings (see Trench's *Authorized Version*, pp. 13, 14),—in a certain intensified acceptation. (See Lightfoot's *Fresh Revision*, p. 172.) The original term denotes *anxious thought*, or, still more literally, according to the common etymology of the word, *distracting thought*, (μὴ προμεριμνᾶτε.) Georg Curtius, however, contends for a different derivation, that would bring into view the idea of *remembering*. (*Grundzüge*, p. 308.) But,—whatsoever the etymology of the word,—it certainly denoted, in actual usage, a state of *anxious thought* or *care*. It is translated *to be careful* in Luke x, 41, where its companion-phrase throws light upon the real idea intended,—"thou art *careful* and *troubled* about many things." The disciples were not to be *careful beforehand*, in the disquieting sense which is sometimes attached to the word *carefulness*. (See *Commentary on Matt.* vi, 25.) The *beforehand* was not intended to limit the period of exemption, and to open a door to legitimate anxiety, after the preliminary stage of things had been passed. It simply brings into natural prominence the time when anxiety is apt to be intensest on the one hand, and is sure on the other to be of the least possible avail.——*Neither do ye premeditate*: This clause is omitted in the manuscripts ℵBDL, 1, 33, 69, and in the Vulgate, Sahidic, Coptic, and Æthiopic versions, and in a large proportion of the 'Old Latin' codices. Tregelles and Tischendorf leave it out. It is not unlikely that the expression was originally a marginal explanation of the preceding clause. Our English translators, in using the compound word '*pre*meditate,' reproduced exactly the form of the original word as it is given by Origen (προμελετᾶτε *Opera*, vol. i, 295), but not its form as it occurs in the *Received Text*. It is simply *meditate, study, con over*. The Geneva of 1557 renders it *prepare;* Tyndale, *ymagion*, i.e. *imagine*. There is, of course,—if the clause be genuine,—no absolute prohibition of *premeditation*, but only, as Petter remarks, of such "as is joined with distracting care." The idea is,—*you need not distress yourselves by anxiously considering beforehand how you ought to speak before*

ever shall be given you in that hour, that speak ye: for it is not ye that speak, [g] but the Holy Ghost.

[g] Acts 4. 8, 31.

12 Now the [h] brother shall betray the brother to death, and the father the son; and children shall rise up against *their* parents, and shall cause them to be put to

[h] Mic. 7. 6.

---

*such high and august personages. Be calm, collected, inartificial, and a higher wisdom than your own will guide your thoughts and mould your words.*———*But whatsoever may be given you in that hour, that speak ye, for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Spirit*:–Many, besides the apostles, have had experience of this high assistance, and have been themselves amazed at the aptness of the ideas and words that were flashed, as occasion required, into their minds. Some fanatics, however, have arbitrarily stretched the Saviour's instructions to the length of covering the idea, that it is wrong for preachers, even in their ordinary preaching, to make previous preparation. But the Saviour is not at all referring to the ordinary ministrations of preachers, or to the expositions of expounders of the 'lively oracles.' He is referring to the contingency of compulsory appearance at the bar of governors and kings. And the design of his instructions is to prevent unmanning disquietude or distress. It is not eloquence, or fine rhetoric, that is needed, when an innocent man is called upon to answer for his conduct in a court of justice. It is candour, calm self-possession, and confidence in a Higher Presence and Power as the Shield of the upright. In that spirit,—the reflex of the brooding Spirit of truth,—let a man stand before his judges, and he is far more likely to say the right thing, and to say it well, than if he were, with ever so much disquietude, to "ymagion" or con-over beforehand what he ought to say.

Ver. 12. *Now*: It is *But* in the original, as in Matt. x, 21. It is *And* in Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles,—a reading authorized by ℵBDL. Tyndale and the Geneva have *yea and*. Coverdale omits the conjunction altogether.———*The brother shall betray the brother to death, and the father the son*:–There are no articles in the original, and their intrusion rather mars the pathetic pointedness of the representation. *And brother shall deliver up brother to death, and father child.* As there is nothing that excites such love as the Gospel, when intelligently received, so there is nothing that occasions such hate as this same Gospel, when passionately rejected. In that reception or rejection the heart of the heart is concerned. Woodman, the Sussex martyr in Queen Mary's days, "was," says Petter, "betrayed and taken by means of his own "father and brother and other friends; whereupon he professed that this very "text of Scripture was verified in him, and he did comfort himself with it."——— *And children shall rise up against parents*:–Literally, *upon parents*. The children shall rise up *to come down 'upon' them*.———*And shall cause them to be put to death*:–Or more simply, and as Tyndale gives it, *and shall put them to death*. Even although the murder be committed through the moral machinery of information, and consequent judicial examination, and technical condemnation, it is still true that the unnatural children themselves are the murderers. Coverdale's translation imitates Luther's, *and shall help them to death*. The Rheims version is, *and shall work their death*. The Geneva paved the way for the Authorized Version, *and shall cause them to die*.

death. 13 And ye shall be [i]hated of all *men* for my name's sake; but [j]he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved.

14 But when ye shall see the abomination of

[i] Luke 6. 22. John 17. 14. 2 Tim. 3. 12.
[j] Mat. 10. 22. Rev. 2. 10.

---

Ver. 13. *And ye shall be hated by all because of my name*:—The real significance of the 'name' will not be considered by the masses. The real mission and aims at once of the servants and of the Master will not be so much as looked at. The public in general will take their cue from the representations of its natural leaders, and hence will hate zealously and remorselessly all who bear the brand of the blessed name. "The vulgar of all sorts," as Richard Baxter expresses it, "will be seduced to take you for the Plagues of the world." The word *all* is used of course popularly,—by a fine graphic kind of hyperbole. *Expect not that the people will pour forth in torrents to welcome you as preachers of the glad tidings. They who extend to you a cordial welcome will be so few, compared with those who neglect or reject your message, that I can scarcely see them at all, as I pass my telescope of prevision across the millions of society.*——*But he that shall endure to the end, he shall be saved*:—With that everlasting salvation which, when consummated, merges in everlasting glorification. '*The end*' referred to is not, specifically, *the end of the age*, but the end of each individual's probationary career. The expression rendered *he that shall endure*, but which is rendered by Coverdale, Wakefield, and Rodolphus Dickinson, *he who endures*, and by Young and Alford, *he who hath endured*, is an aorist participle. The endurance is looked at from the standpoint that intervenes between time and eternity; or, as the same idea may otherwise be represented, from the standpoint of the judgement-day. *He, whose endurance to the end, shall then be found to be an accomplished fact* (ὁ εἰς ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος), *he shall be saved*. Instead of *endure*, Principal Campbell and Norton have *persevere*; Purvey, *lastith*. Our Authorized Translation is admirable, for there is more than *lasting* or *persevering* implied. There is *lasting* or *persevering* '*under*' *trials*.

Ver. 14. *But whenever ye shall see*:—*Ye*, my disciples. The Saviour recognized, in his apostles, the representatives of all the disciples who might be living at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem; and, therefore, in speaking to the former, he realized that he was speaking to all their representees.——*The abomination of desolation*:—A much better translation than Wycliffe's, *the abhomynacioun of discomfort*. It would be better still, however, and more literally, *the abomination of* '*the*' *desolation*, that is, *the abomination connected with the particular devastation that was predicted by Daniel, and that was imminent over Jerusalem and the whole of the Jewish territory*. It is the *devastation* that is referred to in Daniel ix, 27, though the form of the phrase, as given by both Mark and Matthew, is slightly modified from the Septuagintal plural, and thus conformed, so far as the singular number of the word is concerned, to the analogous Septuagintal expressions in Daniel xi, 31, and xii, 11. Compare also 1 Macc. i, 54. The *devastation* to which Daniel and our Lord referred is, manifestly, that desolating devastation of the Holy City and the Holy Land that was effected by the Roman army. Compare Luke xxi, 20. In the Hebrew of Daniel ix, 27, there is brought into view the personal agency that

desolation, spoken of by [k] Daniel the prophet, standing [l] where it ought not, (let him that readeth

[k] Dan. 9. 27.
[l] Mat. 24. 15.

was to be at work in this devastation,—*the abominations of the devastator*, that is, of the collective devastator,—the Roman army. Such variations in the phraseology are the natural result of unfettered thought. They can occasion no difficulty to any method of interpretation, that is free from artificiality and narrowness. Hence, too, we have, in the Hebrew of Daniel ix, 27, the plural word *abominations* instead of the singular *abomination*, as given in the Septuagint and by the evangelist. Both are equally veracious representations. There was to be *a collection of abominations*, and thus there was unity as well as plurality, and plurality as well as unity. The reference is undoubtedly,—according to the conventionalism of the Old Testament usage, and as was discerned by Victor of Antioch,—to the abominations, or collective abomination, of *idols*, that is, of *the idolatrous standards of the Romans*. See *Commentary on Matthew*, xxiv, 15.———*Spoken of by Daniel the prophet*:-This clause is wanting in the manuscripts ℵBDL, and in the Vulgate, Sahidic, Coptic, and Armenian versions; and in a majority too of the Old Latin codices. Augustin certainly had not found it in the copy, or copies, which he used. He quotes,—though for the purpose of remarking on the expression, *standing where it ought not*, as compared with Matthew's, *standing in the Holy Place*,—the whole of Matthew's presentation of the case, and then the whole of Mark's; and, in the quotation of Mark's, the clause *spoken of by Daniel the prophet* is wanting. Griesbach, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, have omitted it from their texts. Frasmus suspected that it had been imported from Matthew xxiv, 15. Grotius agreed with him; and Mill too (*Prol.* §. 408). So Meyer. No doubt correctly,—as constituting by far the most difficult reading, when taken in connection with the intercalated clause, *let him that readeth understand*.———*Standing where it ought not*: That is, in the temple. Compare Matt. xxiv, 15. It is a very remarkable fact that Josephus expressly records that the victorious Romans "brought their ensigns "into the temple, and placed them over against the eastern gate; *and there* "*they offered sacrifices to them*, and with the loudest acclamations proclaimed "Titus emperor." (*Wars*, vi, 6, 1.) Such intrusion of the military standards into the holy place, followed by the deliberate act of causing them to *stand* there, was a wanton desecration, which no exigency of battle, siege, or storming, could justify. The abomination *stood where it ought not*. Petter, looking at the expression from the peculiar standpoint of his theology, says, "in respect of God's decree, *it ought to stand there*"! It is an unnecessary and unhappy 'antinomy.' It suffices for all legitimate theological ends, to regard the sphere of God's decree as coincident with the sphere of his voluntary activity.——— *Let him who readeth understand* (νοείτω):-Let him *exercise his intelligence* (his νόος). Let him *think*. The translation of the word in 2 Tim. ii, 7 will suit admirably, *let him consider*. Coverdale's version is forcible and 'sun-clear,' though free, *let him marck it well*. We are to regard this parenthetical counsel as uttered by our Lord himself, in reference to Daniel's prophecy, not as an interjected *Nota bene* of the evangelist. Such a *Nota bene* on the part of the evangelist,—though approved of by Principal Campbell and others,—

understand,) then let them that be in Judæa flee to the mountains: 15 and let him that is on the housetop not go down into the house, neither enter *therein,* to take any

---

would be an unprecedented intrusion of the narrator's own personality; and it would carry with it something of immodesty, as a kind of presumptuous selection of one from among the other utterances of our Lord, as worthy, on the part of a biographer, of very peculiar emphasis, and, on the part of his readers, of very special consideration. Our Lord's counsel is reported by Matthew also (xxiv, 15); and it is analogous, as Wolf remarks, to the oft-repeated—"*he that hath ears to hear, let him hear.*" Only, as there is a reference to a written prophecy, the counsel points to the duty, not of the *hearer*, but of the *reader*. It is not unlikely that it is the echo of the counsel of the angel Gabriel to Daniel himself, "therefore understand the matter and consider the vision" (Dan. ix, 23). See *Commentary on Matthew*, xxiv, 15.———*Then let them that be in Judæa flee to the mountains*:–It will be in vain for them to persist in the expectation, that there will be a divine interposition, at the last moment, to destroy the Romans and to restore the Jewish state. It is the will of God that the Jewish state should "cease and determine." It is his pleasure to permit the Romans to play out their part in the procession of the dispensations.—Let the disciples, then, who may have been wistfully hovering around the doomed city, betake themselves, without any further delay, to the securest fastnesses, that they may be spared for ulterior duties.

VER. 15. *And*:–Or *but* (δέ), as it is in the great majority of manuscripts, at once cursive and uncial; and in the *Textus Receptus* too.———*Let him that is on the house-top*:–The *dome* (δῶμα). The word originally meant *house*, but in the New Testament usage it invariably means *house-top*, or *roof*. And, indeed, in primitive times, and hot climates, the house would be, in a great measure, a roof or cover. Such would be, and such still are, the *booth* and *tent*.—'*On*' *the house-top*:–For it is a common thing for the Oriental to be 'on' his house-top. It is flat, with frequently a little cupola in the centre. It is a fit place for repose in the cool of the evening, as also for meditation, or for observation. ———*Not go down into the house*:–The expression *into the house* is wanting in the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts, and L; the Syriac-Peshito version too, and the Sahidic and Coptic. Tischendorf omits it. The omission, when taken in connection with the next clause, seems to promote the concinnity of the composition. But, for that very reason, it is to be suspected as a literary pruning. The Saviour intimates that the greatest haste would be requisite, if there was to be a chance of escape from captivity or death. They who, hoping against hope, had lingered on till the storming of the city, and the burning of the temple, had lingered too long. Every moment thenceforward was precious. The Roman cavalry would be instantly flying hither and thither, scouring the country in quest of plunder and captives. And if any one, therefore, was 'on the house-top,' when news arrived that the temple was carried, let him flee at once. Let him, if that would give him a start even of a few moments, just step across the parapet of his own house-top, and run along the line of roofs till he get out to the country, and thence, by the shortest road, to the fastnesses in the hills.——— *Neither enter (therein) to take anything out of his house*:–The phrase *neither enter*

thing out of his house: 16 and let him that is in the field not turn back again for to take up his garment. 17 But woe to them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days! 18 And pray ye that your flight be not in the

---

seems superfluous after the preceding clause. But it may be accounted for, either on the common principle of repetitiousness, or, more probably, on the assumption of an interior beyond an interior in the house. It is common, in oriental houses of a respectable size, for the stair that leads from the roof to terminate *in the court*. He, therefore, who descends such a stair is landed *in the court*, and has thus "come down *into the house*." But when in the court, he may either rush out by the front gate, or enter *into one or more of the chambers* which open from the court. The Saviour glances, both generically and specifically, at both interiors, but specifies, in the second place, that which is inner, because in the order of nature one must go *into the court*, before one can *enter into the other parts of the house.*—*To take anything out of his house*: Though the things might be precious, time would be much more precious still.

VER. 16. *And let him that is in the field*: Viz. working. It is literally *into the field*. In primitive representations, processes, as well as results, would be indicated even in the simplest matters; and when, for brevity's sake, the one or the other of the two elements was omitted, sometimes an arrest took place, phraseologically, at the stage of process, though it was assumed of course that thought would go forward to the stage of result.——*Not turn back to take up his garment*:—His outer robe, which would only have encumbered him while working in his field, but which would be of the greatest advantage to him when resting by night out in the open air, away from the comforts of home. The time gained, however, by fleeing without it, would be of far greater advantage still.

VER. 17. *But woe to them who are with child, and to them that give suck, in those days*:—Or, as Godwin renders it, *But alas for the women who are with child, and for them who suckle, in those days*. The Saviour's heart was more tender than a woman's, and bled when he thought of the anguish that would, in many cases, be inevitable in the hasty flight. How dreadful is defeat, in an embittered war! How dreadful too is victory, in its pursuit of the defeated!

VER. 18. *But pray that your flight be not in winter*:—The expression *your flight* is wanting in ℵ*BDL, and in the Vulgate and Armenian versions, as well as in most of the codices of the Old Latin. It is left out by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles; and it was condemned, as imported from Matthew xxiv, 20, by Mill (*Prol.*, p. xliii), Griesbach, Fritzsche. No doubt it is a supplement,—so that the original expression would be, *But pray that it be not in winter*, that is,—*pray that all this that I have been speaking of do not take place amid the severities of wintry weather*. These would greatly aggravate the sufferings of the sufferers. The word for *winter* may mean *a storm* or *stormy weather*. See Matt. xvi, 3, and Acts xxvii, 20. Wakefield renders it here *rainy weather*. The whole expression, *that it be not in winter*, exhibits, in the original, not so much the subject-matter of the prayer, as the end that was to be contemplated in praying. *Pray,—in order that it be not in winter*, (ἵνα). The idea of the act of prayer is

winter. 19 [m]For *in* those days shall be affliction, such as was not from the beginning of the creation which God created unto this time, neither shall be. 20 And except that the Lord had shortened those days, no

[m] Dan. 12. 1. Joel 2. 2. Matt. 24. 21.

accordingly modified. Were the subject-matter of the prayer coming up into prominence, the idea of the act would be narrowed into that of petition. But when prominence is given to the final cause of the act, then the idea of prayer is widened into that of general address or appeal to Him who ruleth over all, and can and will overrule whatever may be brought to pass by his creatures.

VER. 19. *For*: Such prayer will be much needed, as a means of obtaining some little mitigation of the inevitable woes.——*(In) those days shall be affliction*:—There is, in the original, no *in* before *those days*. The expression is very striking,—*For those days shall be an affliction* or *a tribulation*. Instead of the tribulation being represented as *occurring in the time*, the days are, so to speak, transubstantiated into the affliction.——*Such as has not been from the beginning of the creation which God created until the present time, and shall not be*: One might explain this language on the principle of that graphic hyperbolism, that pervades, to so large an extent, the speech of all peoples. It is quite common, in many languages at least, if not in all, to say of any very extraordinary affliction,—it is *the greatest possible*. Superlatives are often employed, when there is really no definite intention of asserting a perfectly absolute prominence. It is at the same time, however, worthy of consideration, whether there was not, in this catastrophe of the Jews, a mingling of elements, physical, intellectual, moral, and spiritual, which was so unique, as to render the anguish, that was consequent on the overthrow of Jerusalem, unprecedented, and incapable of future recurrence. Many peoples have been vanquished. Often have surviving populations been 'peeled,' and scattered or led captive. Often have capital cities been stormed and sacked. But the case of the Jews was peculiar. They were convinced that they were the favourites of heaven. They regarded their capital as 'the city of the Great King,' and the predestined Mistress of the world. Their temple was to them the One House of God. It could not be dispensed with in the world. Hence they expected, up to the last moment, that 'the Lord's arm' must needs be made conspicuously 'bare,' in the extremity of their necessity, to smite the beleaguering hosts, like the hosts of Sennacherib of yore, and thus to rescue the beloved place and the beloved people! When one mingles the elements of such thoughts and feelings, and their effects, with the effects of the utter social disorganization that prevailed, and consequently with the unutterable physical woes that preceded and succeeded the capture of the temple, it is easy to see that the tribulation endured may have had an edge of agony, which never was before, in the history of any people, and which will never be again. See *Commentary on Matthew* xxiv, 21. The word *creation* is used objectively, as equivalent to *the created world*.

VER. 20. *And unless the Lord had shortened the days*:—The Saviour does not particularly refer to himself when he says *the Lord*. He refers to Him who is the absolute One, *Jehovah* or *Jahveh*.—*Shortened*:—Or *curtailed*. It is not said *should curtail*. The reader is transported forward to the time, when the

flesh should be saved: but for the elect's sake, whom he hath chosen, he hath shortened the days.

21 And then if any man shall say to you,[n] Lo, here *is* Christ; or, lo, *he is* there; believe *him* not: [n] Luke 17. 23. Luke 21. 8.

---

tribulation referred to had passed its culminating point. He looks back from his standpoint upon the anguish, as it was at its intensest; and he is told that the reason why it is already past is,—*Jehovah had curtailed the days of it's duration.*—*The days*:—Not *those days*, as in our Authorized Version, and in Matthew. The definite article is sufficient. The days referred to were really curtailed in number, beyond what might have been anticipated. A concurrence of contingencies contributed to this result. Titus, the Commander, was personally disposed to clemency and moderation. He loved a Jewess too,—Bernice, the sister of Agrippa. He esteemed Josephus, moreover,—the Jewish historian. And he was in haste, besides, to get to Rome that he might share in the triumphal entry of his father Vespasian, and enjoy the splendid festivities of such a jubilant occasion. All these things and others might be divinely overruled,—and no doubt were,—to curtail the days of Judæa's anguish.——— *No flesh should have been saved*:—*No flesh*, that is, *none*, viz. of the Jews. There would have been an almost total extermination of the race. So exasperated were the Romans. And so fitted were they, by their victories, to carry this exasperation into fatal effect. The idiomatic phrase "no-*flesh*" was a Hebraism, remarkably corresponding to our English "no-*body*."———*But because of the elect whom he elected, he curtailed the days*: The motive that moved the will of "the Lord" is revealed. He had a special regard to *the elect* "*in Christ*" (Eph. i, 4), whom he elected; and hence, that they might not be extirpated, he overrulingly curtailed the days of tribulation. *He*, and no other, *elected* them. He *selected* them, that is to say, for the enjoyment of peculiar blessings, and the performance of peculiar duties. They were hence objects, so to speak, of a peculiar solicitude or care, that affected the divine heart, moved the divine will, and guided the divine hand. This solicitude, however, or special divine care, was not the result of any arbitrary predilection. *The elect in Christ*, or, in other words, *the true Christians*, were, for all the great moral ends which were contemplated by the Divine Grace, the Flower of the population; and, so far as human agency was concerned, they were the Hope of the world.

Ver. 21. *And then*:—*Then* and thenceforward indefinitely. No definite chronological measurements are made by our Lord, beyond the period of the great Jewish crisis. The varying elongations, in time, of the succeeding futurities do not come within the scope of the prophetic perspective.———*If any one shall say to you, Lo here the Christ! Lo there! do not believe*:—When *the Christ* does appear again, it will be in no obscure way. Human testimonies or telegrams will be altogether unnecessary. No one will need to be dependent on another for information concerning the fact. "Every eye shall see him."

Ver. 22. There is need for such a warning. *For there shall arise false Christs*:—There have been many of them. David George, for instance, who ultimately settled at Basle, where he died in 1556. He claimed, according to the account of Dr. Henry More, *to be the true Christ, the dear Son of God, born not of the flesh, but of the Spirit. He was to restore the house of Israel,*

22 for false Christs and false prophets shall rise, and shall

---

*and re-erect the tabernacle of God, not by afflictions and death, as the other Messiah, but by that sweetness, love, and grace, that were given him of the Father. He had the power of the remission of sins; and had come to administer the last judgement.* He averred that "*the Holy Scriptures, the sayings and "testimonies of the prophets, of Christ, and of his apostles, do all point, if rightly "understood, in their true mystery, to the glorious coming of David George, "who is greater than the former Christ, as being born of the Spirit, and not of "the flesh.*" (*Enthusiasmus Triumphatus*, §. 34.) This David George, says Dr. More, was a man "of notable natural parts, of comely person, and a graceful presence." And he had many adherents, who believed in him. In our own day there are persons,—out of asylums,—who put forth corresponding claims. There is lying before the writer a "Tract on the Second Advent fulfilled," in which it is said that "the enrolling of the saints commenced on the anni- "versary of the last day of the Feast of Tabernacles of the year 1868, that is, "on the 9th October, 1868. The following," it is added, "is the declaration "to be made and signed:—*I believe Jesus of Nazareth to be the Messiah at his "first coming and the antitypical Paschal Lamb who died for sin in allegory, "and I believe John Cochran of Glasgow to be that Messiah at his second "coming and the antitypical High Priest who has taken away sin in reality.*" Of all such persons it has, in consequence of their obscurity, to be said *Lo here! Lo there!* "Believe not," says our Saviour.———*And false prophets*:—They have been Legion in number. Lodowick Muggleton, for instance, who, on the title-page of his *True Interpretation of the whole Book of the Revelation of St. John* (1746), describes himself as "one of the two last commissionated Witnesses and Prophets of the only high, immortal, glorious God, Christ Jesus." Madame Antoinette Bourignon, before him, was a far nobler being, yet she declared to Christian de Cort, "I am sent from God to bring light to the "world, and to bear witness to the truth. He has sent me to tell that the "last times are come; that the world is judged, and the sentence is irre- "vocable; that the plagues are begun, and will not cease till all evil be rooted "out; and that Jesus Christ will come shortly to the earth to finish this, "and then he will continue to reign with 'men of goodwill,' who shall enjoy "eternal peace. I am sent with a commission to declare all these things to "men, to the end that peradventure some of them may be converted and "repent, that they may reign with Jesus Christ in his glory."—"I am cer- "tainly sent from God to declare the truth of everything." (*The Light of the World, Part III, pp.* 45, 46, *ed.* 1696.)———*And shall show signs and wonders*:—Literally, *and shall 'give,'* viz. as evidence. It is a somewhat peculiar and semi-awkward word. But, notwithstanding its peculiarity, it is strange that Tischendorf should actually reject it from the text, and, on the mere authority of the Cambridge manuscript (D), a few cursives, and some free quotations or allusions of Origen, substitute, in its place, *do* or *perform* (ποιήσουσιν). It seems hard to suppose that any fastidious or critical transcriber would ever have turned *perform* into *give*, if he found *perform* in the codex from which he was copying. But it is easy to conceive that occasionally a transcriber, of little depth or perspicacity of judgement, might be tempted to substitute the

shew signs and wonders, to seduce, if *it were* possible, even

---

easy-going *perform* for the more rugged *give*,—imagining all the time that, instead of doing any harm to the sacred text, he was merely, without modifying the idea, smoothing and improving a comparatively unimportant expression. It is noteworthy, moreover, that many modern translators, who had no other word in the texts that were lying before them, than *give*, have taken, nevertheless, the liberty of freely rendering it *do*. So Luther, Piscator, Zinzendorf, Heumann, (all of whom have *thun*). Worsley renders it *work*; Principal Campbell *perform*. It is *give* which is the reading of ℵABCL, and indeed of all the rest of the uncials, except D. It is supported, too, by all the ancient versions.———*Signs and wonders*:—"Lying wonders" (2 Thess. ii, 9) no doubt, —wonders that serve a purpose of imposition, partly, it may be, on the wonder-workers themselves, and partly on those whom they wish to attach to themselves. There are wonderful idiosyncrasies among men, that give scope for the performance of such wonders. In some natures,—as in Valentine Greatrakes and Gassner (See Howitt's *History of the Supernatural*),—singular therapeutic energies instinctively well up and flow over. In others there is a singular power of something like 'second sight' or 'clairvoyance,' turning fitfully its penetrative eye, now upon objects distant in space, and now upon objects distant in time,—though in a way far removed from infallibility. This clairvoyant eye often takes cognizance of only frivolous realities, and seems blind to things of moment. Still its peculiarity is fitted,—when once a willing and shallow fanaticism tries its hand at understanding it,—to be a "lying wonder." There are other remarkable endowments and instincts, which crop up at times in exceptional idiosyncracies, and may give occasion either to self-delusion, or to deliberate artifice, or to a minglement of the two perversities.———*To seduce*:—That is, *in order to seduce*, or *with the view of seducing* (πρὸς τό). Intention is expressed, even though it should be the product of self-delusion. At the base of the self-delusion there must be unconscientiousness, if insanity be absent; and if so, the whole outcome becomes morally tainted. There is something that is resolvable into *an intention to seduce*, or *to proselytize to one's self*. Instead of *seduce*,—a word got by our translators from the Rheims,—Tyndale and the Geneva have *deceive*; Wakefield, *to draw away*; Campbell, *to impose on*. Literally, *to cause to wander off*, that is, *to seduce*.———*If possible, even the elect*:—An expression crowded in. It is not meant to represent, subjectively, a detail in the intention of the Pretenders. It rather depicts, objectively, the subtlety of the imposition. There is such a plausibility of evidence, that, *if it were possible, even the elect would be seduced*.—The *elect*:—The truly Christian, who are divinely segregated, not only from the world at large, but also from all such as are but superficially or nominally Christian. See on verse 20. These true Christians, the Saviour intimates, it is not possible to seduce. As a body, that is to say, or in their entirety. They "cannot err damnably," says Tyndale the Reformer; "nor any long time; nor all of them." (*Prologue to Exposition of Sermon on the Mount.*) The last idea should get prominence. Individuals have often, no doubt, been sadly imposed upon, and led far astray in their notions, and in those actions that are the natural outworkings of notions. But in the midst of the spiritual freedom that is the spiritual birth-right of all truly

the elect. 23 But [o] take ye heed: behold, I have foretold you all things.

[o] 2 Pet. 3. 17.

24 But in those days, after that tribulation, the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light,

---

spiritual persons, there is no fear of universal delusion. A seed to do God service will never fail. The holy bush that burns will never be consumed, whatever may become of withered branches and some sickly sprays.

VER. 23. *But take ye heed*:—There is an emphasis on the *ye*,—*But look 'ye.'* The Saviour no doubt addresses the disciples who were seated around him, hanging on his lips. But the caution would be meant to be handed down from generation to generation.———*Behold, I have foretold you all*:—The Saviour had omitted nothing that was needed to set them, and to preserve them, on their guard. It may have been unwelcome to their Jewish prejudices and fervid anticipations to be told of such difficulties, intricacies, dangers, and trials. No doubt it would be. But the Lord did not on that account leave them unwarned. He sought to send them forward into the future forearmed.

VER. 24. *But*:—It is as if he had said, *Now to turn for a little to another view.*———*In those days*:—In those future days,—forward to which the Saviour's eye was looking.———*After that tribulation*:—Of which he had been speaking in verses 14—20; that is, after the tribulation connected with the destruction of Jerusalem, and the dissolution of the Jewish State and Dispensation. The Saviour does not enter farther into chronological measurements and adjustments. Possibly, as he looked beyond the scene, which presented to his view "the abomination of desolation" in the "temple," and the connected catastrophes and woes,—the whole perspective may have had no precise chronological subdivisions, indicated by means of milestones of time, and marking off the exact stages of succession. But the things toward which he looked, and of which he now begins to speak, belonged, as Calvin saw, and, still more clearly, Luther, Zuingli, Wesley, not to the end of the Jewish State and Dispensation, but to *the end of the present age*, or, as it is often, though less properly represented, *the end of the world*. So too Petter. (See, among many other Dissertations, Schott's *Commentarius Exegetico-dogmaticus*, pp. 73–124.)———*The sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light*:—Eclipses are described. Bengel, in his German Translation, has, *and the moon shall not give 'his' light*, inasmuch as the Moon is masculine in German, and the Sun feminine. So Emser, Piscator, Felbinger, Zinzendorf, Stolz, Meyer, in their respective German versions. Luther, deftly, throws a veil over the genders,—*the sun and moon shall lose 'their' light.*—Their *light*, their *lustre*, their *shine* as Luther has it. The language is not intended to be pressed into the service of scientific representation. Otherwise there would not have been a coincidence of solar and lunar eclipses. The representation is a method of sublime hieroglyphic imagery,—meaning that a great and portentous change will, at some future time, take place in the world at large, in relation to the rest of the universe. Of this great ultimate crisis and change there have been, in times past, and there will no doubt yet be in times to come, many partial or local rehearsals. Compare the language of Isai. xiii, 9—19; xxiv, 19—23; Ezek. xxxii, 7.

25 and the [p] stars of heaven shall fall, and the powers that are in heaven shall be shaken. 26 And [q] then shall they see the Son of man coming in

[p] 2 Pet. 3. 10. Rev. 6. 13. Rev. 20. 11.
[q] Dan. 7. 13.

Mat. 24. 30. Mat. 16. 27. Mark 14. 62. Acts 1. 11. 1 Th. 4. 16. 2 Th. 1. 7. Rev. 1. 7.

---

VER. 25. *And the stars of heaven shall fall* :-Or,—as the reading runs in Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, as in the manuscripts ℵABCUII*, and in the Syriac-Peshito, Coptic, Sahidic, and Æthiopic versions,—*and the stars shall be falling out of the heaven.* This grand rhetoric is by no means, in its basis, purely imaginative,—any more than the expressions in the preceding verse. It is founded on those extraordinary and awfully magnificent meteoric phenomena, which occur in full force periodically, every thirty-three years, in the month of November. Our earth at that time passes through the nucleus of a belt of meteors, and the result is an unintermitting shower, for hours, of "falling stars." This spectacle,—so splendid on the one hand, and so appalling on the other to such as are ignorant of astronomy,—occurred last on the night between the 13th and the 14th days of November, 1866.——*And the powers that are in the heavens shall be shaken* :-Wahl supposes that these *powers* are the *stars*. So Bretschneider and Grimm. Robinson, that they are "the sun, moon, and stars." But either the wider or the narrower of these suppositions introduces unnatural tautology into the phraseology. Cardinal Cajetan supposes that the reference is to *the active powers of those heavenly bodies which exert an astrological influence on things terrestrial:* while Petter, prosaically, imagines that the phrase denotes "the natural force, strength, or virtue which is" intrinsic "in the whole body and frame of the starry heavens." It is more likely that the reference is to invisible or personal *Powers* or *Hosts*, as distinguished from Hosts visible and impersonal. We may think of the high and holy hosts that surround the throne of the Eternal. (See 1 Kings xxii, 19; Ps. ciii, 21; cxlviii, 2.) Or we may think of the lower hosts which are subject to "the prince of the power of the air" (Eph. ii, 2), and which, under certain fixed limitations, have malign influences under their control. It is more likely that there is a reference here to these latter; for the great cosmical changes spoken of seem to be introductory to that dissolution of the 'heavens' as they at present are, and the 'earth,' which is to precede the emergence of "the new heavens and new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." See 2 Peter iii, 10—13.

VER. 26. *And then* :-Ere the end, but yet toward 'the beginning of the end.' ——*Shall they see the Son of man coming in the clouds* :—Or, more literally, *in clouds*, i.e. *amid clouds*. It might also have been said *on clouds*. See Matt. xxiv, 30. Compare Psalm civ, 3, and Isai. xix, 1. The clouds,—which will be rolling over the troubled sky, and which are the fitting symbols at once of the impending crisis, and of the impenetrable mystery that surrounds the throne of Him who rules over it,—will be, as it were, the sublime drapery of his presence, illumined "with the brightness of his coming" (2 Thess. ii, 8).—*Shall they see him* :-*They*,—men in general,—men universally. 'Every eye shall see him.' (Rev. i, 7.)——*With much power and glory* :-With that pomp of appearance and attendance, that is fitted to make known to all, at once his inherent *power* and his essential *glory*.

the clouds with great power and glory. 27 And then shall he send his angels, and shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from the uttermost part of the earth to the uttermost part of heaven.

28 Now learn a parable of the fig tree; When her branch

---

VER. 27. *And then shall he send forth his angels*:—The *his* is undoubtedly genuine, though it is wanting in the Vatican and Cambridge manuscripts, and has been left out by Tischendorf and Tregelles. The angels belong to our Lord as his 'ministering spirits' (Heb. i, 14).———*And shall gather together his elect*:—Tischendorf and Tregelles omit *his* in this clause too; but on quite insufficient grounds. It is found in ℵABC, and indeed in all the uncials except DL. The elect on earth belong to Christ, as truly as the angels in heaven. The proprietorship is assumed by him as a matter of course. So thoroughly imperial and divine was our Lord's self-consciousness, even in the depth of his humiliation.—*Gather together*:—To meet Himself, and to be with Himself, so as to be preserved in safety, and exalted to glory. All the details, however, of the physical and moral machinery, by means of which the ultimate glory is to be reached, are shaded off, and hence nothing is here said of the resurrection, or of physical transformation, or of the general judgement. See 1 Thess. iv, 14–17.———*From the four winds*: Literally, *Out of the four winds*, for the word *winds* is used in its secondary acceptation, to denote the *quarters* of the earth's surface, from which the winds blow, — east, west, south, and north. The earth, to every spectator, is optically a circle. If the circle be subdivided into four equal segments, these segments are the *quarters*, on which the various points of the compass may be calculated. The Hebrews, in distinguishing the quarters, supposed themselves to be looking to the rising of the sun. The east was in *front*; the west, *behind*; the south was *the right hand*; the north, *the left*. (Compare *the Hebrew words.*)———*From the uttermost part of the earth to the uttermost part of heaven*: Or, more literally, *from earth's extremity to heaven's extremity*. Bleek supposes that there is a reference, in the one phrase, to the saints that shall be alive on the earth, and in the other, to those who shall have fallen asleep in Jesus, and whose souls shall be in heavenly places. But in that case we should have expected the expression to have run thus,—*from earth's extremity, and 'from' heaven's extremity*, that is, *from earth's extremity all over 'its' plane, and from heaven's extremity all over 'its' plane*. It is far more probable that the expression is only a variety of phrase for *from horizon to horizon*. Compare Matt. xxiv, 31. "The extremities," says Petter, "of the heavens and of the earth are supposed to be the same, and are put for one and the same." Optically the earth and heavens meet at the horizon, so that the idea is, *from one extremity of the world—(take the horizon at what point you please)—to the other*. Tyndale's translation actually is, *from one ende of the worlde to the other*, and this, though free, is certainly much to be preferred to Principal Campbell's, *from the extremities of heaven and earth*.

VER. 28. The filament of thought that floated into the far future is let go with what precedes. The Saviour returns to the consideration of what was more immediately to transpire. *Now*:—It is *But* (δέ) in the original.———

is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is near: 29 so ye in like manner, when ye shall see these things come to pass, know that it is nigh, *even* at the doors.

---

*Learn a parable of the fig tree*:-Or, literally, *From the fig tree learn 'the' parable.* That is, *From the fig tree,—as for instance in its present state,—learn 'the' indirect-instruction, which it is so admirably fitted to suggest, and which is so appropriate to the case in hand.* It is probable that a fig tree was close by. Perhaps the little company were sitting under its shade, as they looked west toward Jerusalem.——*When her branch*: The word properly means *a young branch* or *spray*, which may be easily *broken off* (κλάδος). Note the *her*. The pronoun *its* was only coming into use at the time when our Translation of 1611 was made, and was not adopted by our Translators. (See *Commentary on Matt.* v, 13.) Hence either *his* or *her* had to do duty in its place. It is *her* in the Greek, for the word *fig-tree* is feminine; but it is *his* in German and therefore in Luther, for the word *tree*, in German, is masculine. Tyndale too has *his*, and our Translators have preserved the *his* in Matt. xxiv, 32.——*Is yet tender*: The *yet* is apt to lead the mind to think in the direction rather of the conclusion, than of the commencement, of a period. The original term (ἤδη), however, means *already* or *by this time.* Wycliffe has *now*; and so have the original Geneva (1557) and the Rheims. The idea is—*when once its branch has become tender*:-*Tender*, under the reviving influences of spring, when the 'hibernacles' or winter-quarters of the leaves become flushed with the living juices, out of which the new growths are to be elaborated.——*And putteth forth leaves*:-Or rather, *and the leaves are put forth*, that is, *and the leaves have sprouted forth.* The verb is in the passive, so that the expression *the leaves* forms the *subject* of the proposition. (Read, not ἐκφύῃ with Beza, the Elzevirs, and Tischendorf, but ἐκφυῇ with Erasmus, Bengel, Matthæi, Fritzsche, Lachmann, Tregelles. It was the reading, too, of Schott ultimately, and of the 1st, 3rd, and 4th editions of Robert Stephens.)——*Ye know that summer is nigh*:-Or more literally, *'the' summer.* Its out-riders have arrived.

VER. 29. *So also ye*:-There is emphasis on the *ye* (ὑμεῖς). The same parties, indeed, were both spoken of, and spoken to, in the preceding verse; for it is *they* who are referred to, as knowing the signs of coming summer. Yet, in the approach of summer, and in the signs which herald it, they had no special interest. They were hence referred to in a merely representative way; and our Lord meant that the signs of coming summer are known *of men in general.* But the coming of the great national crisis, which our Lord had in view in his illustration, was a matter that had bearings of very special importance for the disciples.——*When ye shall see these things coming to pass*:-*These things*,—not the last things spoken of, in verses 24—27, but the things that had formed the bulk and burden of his prophetic utterances, and that were referred to by the disciples, when, in verse 4, they asked "when shall *these things* be?" The reference is to the precursors of the destruction of the temple and city of Jerusalem. See *Commentary on Matt.* xxiv, 33. ——*Know that it is nigh, at the doors*:-Literally, *on (the) doors.* Note the plural. *Folding-doors* are referred to,—as so frequently in Homer. The outer

30 Verily I say unto you, that [r]this generation shall not pass, till all these things be done. [r] Mat. 16. 28. Mat. 24. 34.

---

doors of oriental houses at the present day are generally folding, if the houses have courts. But, idiomatically, *at the door* is identical with *at the doors*; and it is more consonant with our British ideas, for folding-doors are exceptional in Britain, and even when they are used, they are still *the door*. The Saviour does not specify, by name, *what it is that would be at the door*. It is *that which constituted the burden of his thoughts, and the burden of the thoughts of his disciples,—that which occasioned the whole of the long prophetic discourse contained in this chapter*, viz. the destruction of the city and temple of Jerusalem. See verse 2nd. This, the subject of the proposition, did not need to be formally stated, being perfectly well understood.

VER. 30. *Verily I say to you*:-Christ's solemn way of saying, *I do assure you.*——*That this generation shall not pass away till all these things have come to pass*:-The *things*, namely, which were to be the precursors of the national crisis, and which were to terminate in that crisis. The crisis therefore is itself included. The destruction of Jerusalem did happen, in harmony with our Saviour's prediction, within the limits of the existing generation. It happened in the year 70 of the Christian era, between thirty and forty years after the prophecy was uttered. Many expositors, missing their way through the Discourse as a whole, and thus unable to disintegrate the references to *the end of the age* from the references to *the end of the Jewish temple and temple service*, have been driven to their wits' end to account for the statement of this verse. Hence attempts have been made to interpret *this generation* as having reference to quality of characteristics, rather than to time and contemporaneity. Some suppose that the expression means *this race (of Jews)*. Among others, Ryle takes this view. He says, "I take this opportunity of expressing my decided opinion that *this generation* can only mean *this nation* or *people*,—the Jewish nation." (*Thoughts on Mark*, p. 290.) Others suppose that it means *this race (of men)*,—"the totality of men." So Klostermann, in recent times. We would not object, with Alexander, to the principle of these interpretations on the ground that the word *generation* (γενεά) always means, and must always mean, *a contemporary race*. The ineptitude, that would be characteristic of the prediction, on either of the two hypotheses, is a far weightier objection. M. Roustaing's interpretation is still more objectionable, though given spiritualistically, as he alleges, by the Evangelists themselves assisted by Moses! He supposes that the meaning is, *-this generation when re-incarnated (in the latter days)*. See *Les Quatre Évangiles expliqués par les Évangélistes*. Tome ii, p. 639—645. The expression *this generation* was a familiar one with our Saviour, and, in all other cases, was used by him to denote *the sum-total, (in some given sphere), of the persons then living*. Compare Matt. xi, 16; xii, 41, 42, 45; xxiii, 36; Mark viii, 12, 38; Luke vii, 31; xi, 30, 31, 32, 50, 51; xvii, 25. The statement before us is definitely fixed down and explained by the equivalent and unequivocal expression in Matt. xvi, 28. *Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.* Richard Baxter correctly reproduces the idea—

31 [s]Heaven and earth shall pass away: but [t]my words shall not pass away.

32 But of that day and *that* hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.

[s] Psa. 102. 26. Heb. 1. 11. 2 Pet. 3. 10.
[t] Isa. 40. 8. 1 Pet. 1. 25.

---

"Some now alive shall live to see it." See *Commentary on Matt.* xvi, 28, and xxiv, 34.

Ver. 31. *The heaven and the earth shall pass away*:–Notwithstanding their apparent stability. They are ever changing, and passing on to farther change. They are never for two successive millenniums, or for two successive moments, in exactly the same state. Witness the revelations of geology and of astronomy. Consider the prodigious dissipation of heat or 'energy' into space. Suns burn out. Solar systems must collapse. (See Kant's *Naturgeschichte*, c. vii.) Our Saviour assumes it. Those who are on the summits of science see it, and can demonstrate it. (See the papers of Sir William Thomson and Mr. Croll *on Geological time.*) "The earth," says Sir William Thomson, "is filled with evidences that it has not been going on for ever in the present state, and that there is a progress of events toward a state infinitely different from the present." § 20. The sun, he elsewhere says, is most probably "simply an incandescent mass cooling."—*Geological Dynamics*, § 40.———*But my words shall not pass away*:–*My words* concerning the fate of Jerusalem, as concerning other things. They partake of the immortality of truth. How towering the self-consciousness of our Lord! And yet he was no sciolist on the one hand, and no braggart on the other. Was he then deluded? It cannot be: *his prediction was literally fulfilled.*

Ver. 32. *But of that day*:–Literally, *But concerning that day.* There is a strong emphasis on the *that*,—the intended effect of which is, that the thought takes a vault to a time far beyond the things referred to in the preceding verse,—*that day of days;—that great day,—the culmination of all the days of this preliminary age.* Compare 2 Tim. i, 12, 18; iv, 8.———*And that hour*:–The *that* is not repeated here in the original. There is simply the article,—*and 'the' hour.* But in the Uncial Manuscripts ABCEGHKLMUVWXΓΔΠ, as in the Vulgate and Philoxenian-Syriac versions, it is not '*and*' but '*or*' *the hour*,—a variation from the representation in Matt. xxiv, 36. The *or* is accepted by Griesbach, Fritzsche, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles. The idea suggested is, that whether the great crisis-time be looked at in its nearer, or in its remoter proximity to the actual chronological point of occurrence, the relation to it of finite foreknowledge is the same.———*Knoweth no man*:–Literally, and better, *knoweth no one.* See the exceptive clause at the conclusion of the verse. ———*Not the angels who are in heaven*:–The negative represented by the English *not* has a continuative import imbedded in it (οὐδέ); and the idea in such a case as the one before us may be thus expressed, *not even the angels.* ———*Neither the Son*:–It is more than *neither*,—'*nor yet*' *the Son*, (οὐδέ again: see Clyde's *Greek Syntax*, § 56, c.).———*But the Father*:–Very literally, *if not the Father*, that is *unless the Father, except the Father*, (εἰ μή). The expression is to be connected with the clause, *no one knoweth*,—*no one except the Father.* The Father's absolute omniscience, and his consequent absolute prescience, is

33 [u] Take ye heed, watch and pray: for ye know not when the time is. 34 *For the Son of man is* as a man taking a far journey, who left his house,

[u] Mat. 25. 13. Luke 12. 40. 1 Thes. 5. 6. Rev. 16. 15.

assumed by the Saviour,—even although the object of the prescience is chronologically conditioned on millions of intervening free acts on the part of millions of free agents. When absolute prescience, however, is denied by the Son on the part of himself, he is, of course, referring to himself *as Son, begotten on a certain day* (Ps. ii, 7; Acts xiii, 33) *in the virgin's womb* (Luke i, 35). He is, in other words, referring to himself, as he was self-realized in his finite nature, to be for ever distinguished from that infinite essence, in which he made the worlds (John i, 3), sustains them (Col. i, 17), sees the end from the beginning (John vi, 64), and "knows all things" (John xxi, 17). The expression perplexed Ambrose. He suspected that it had been interpolated by the hand of a heretic. (*De Fide*, lib. v, 16.) It perplexed Dr. Adam Clarke too, who was likewise disposed to suspect its genuineness. But it is certain that it is no interpolation. And there is really no embarrassing difficulty. It is only when we proceed on a 'monophysist' hypothesis, and assume that our Saviour's divinity was his only Mind, and the Soul of his humanity, that overwhelming difficulty is encountered.——Some ardent 'students of prophecy' have supposed that it is merely the 'hour' and 'day' of the second coming of our Lord that are inscrutable, not the year, month, or week of the occurrence. And hence the numerous predictions of the dawning 'year' of the Millennium, which have shot, time after time, across the literary heavens like meteors. They have, one and all, been fictitious. And to persist in similar experiments of calculation is but to persist in a waste of ingenuity.

VER. 33. Other exercises than those of calculative ingenuity become us. *Take ye heed, watch and pray*: That is, *See that ye watch and pray. See*, or *Look to it* (βλέπετε). Wakeful watchfulness and prayerfulness constitute the proper attitude of the souls of men, all down through the ages to the great day. ——*For ye know not when* (πότε = ὁπότε) *the time is*:—*The right point of time* (ὁ καιρός) *for the glorious epiphany.* It is well therefore to be always 'looking for,' and 'longing for' or 'hasting to,' the coming of the day of God (2 Pet. iii, 12),—for, so far as the individual interests of individual souls are concerned, it is certain that a great change will soon and perhaps suddenly occur; and it matters little—so far as these same individual interests are concerned—whether Christ come to us, or we go to Christ.

VERSES 34, 35. There is a fine comparison in these verses. But it is only partially wrought out. Yet, though partial, it is not so complete a torso as it seems to be in our Authorized Version, as also in the Geneva, and in Beza's version, from which our translators borrowed the supplementary clause at the commencement of verse 34.

VER. 34. *As a man taking a far journey*:—Or rather, as Tyndale gives it, *as a man which is gone in to a straunge countrey.* So Purvey, *as a man that is gone far in pilgrimage.* The man is thought of, not as *going*, but as *gone.* He is thought of as *already abroad.*——*Who left his house*:—The clause is participial in the original, and might be rendered, *when he left his house.* The mind reverts to what he did before he went abroad; and, in thus reverting, it heaps

and gave authority to his servants, and to every man his work, and commanded the porter to watch. 35 Watch ye therefore: for ye know not when the master of the house cometh, at even, or at midnight, or at the cockcrowing, or

---

together, in a peculiar order, a series of successive acts. One of these is, *he left his house.* But before this took place, certain other acts were performed. See next clause.———*And gave to his servants authority* :–Very literally, *the authority,* namely, that was requisite to regulate their demeanour in his absence. ———*And to every one his work* :–The *and* is wanting in ℵBC*DL, and is left out by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles.———*And commanded the porter to watch* :–The *and* in this clause was perplexing to Beza. He regarded it as standing in the way. He therefore "expunged" it. Arbitrarily however. Bengel understood it correctly, and hence renders it *also.* So Meyer,—'*also' enjoined the porter that he should be watchful,* or, *in order that he should be watchful.* The other acts of the gentleman abroad are regarded, for the moment, as subordinate to this. What then? See next verse. But there should not be a full point at the conclusion of this. The application of the comparison is contained in what follows.

Ver. 35. *Be watchful therefore* :–The *therefore* crowds into itself the whole force of the comparison contained in the preceding verse. It is as if it were said, *As the person abroad, whom I am depicting on the tablet of my imagination, gave strict injunctions to the gate-keeper to be perpetually on the outlook for his return, so say I to you, Be ye watchful.* The word for *watchful* in this and the preceding verse is a term of the later Greek, and denotes *a waked-up* condition. The proper name *Gregory* is derived from it. The word employed in the 33rd verse is different, and denotes *sleeplessness.*———*For ye know not when the master of the house cometh* :–The figure in the comparison of the preceding verse is kept up. The Saviour instead of saying, *he who corresponds to the master of the house in the comparison,* just speaks of himself as *the master of the house,* for he is indeed a Master, and has a household and a house.—'*Ye' know not* :–The disciples of all ages are addressed through their representatives, the apostles. It is in vain therefore for any one to fix the precise date of the Millennium.———*At even* :–In the manuscripts ℵBCLΔ the disjunctive particle is found before this expression, and has been received into the text by Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford,—*or, either,* and here *whether.* It is probably authentic. The word rendered *even,* properly means *late evening.* It began at sunset and lasted for three hours, or till the middle-point between sunset and midnight. Originally the Hebrews seem to have divided the night into three watches. (See Judg. vii, 19, where we read of *the middle watch:* and compare Buxtorf's *Lexicon Talmudicum,* p. 2454, and Lightfoot's *Works,* vol. iv, p. 198.) But in the time of our Lord the Roman division into four watches had superseded the older Hebrew style.———*Or at midnight* :–The second watch extended from 9 till 12 o'clock. The various watches were named from their terminations, rather than from their beginnings.———*Or at the cock-crowing* :–More literally, and better, without the article, *at cock-crowing.* So Wycliffe and Purvey, *(at) cockis crowynge.* The Roman word was *gallicinium.* In some of the Jewish towns, at the present day,

in the morning: 36 lest coming suddenly he find you [c] sleeping. 37 And what I say unto you I say [v] unto all, Watch.

[c] Mat. 25. 5.

## CHAPTER XIV.

*The Passover festival was at hand; and the chief priests and scribes enter into a conspiracy to compass the death of Jesus,* 1. *They wished, however, to allow the festivity to go past,* 2. *Jesus, while at Bethany, was anointed by a woman,* 3. *Some murmured at the waste of the ointment,* 4, 5; *but Jesus rebuked them, and defended the devoted act of the woman,* 6—9. *Judas Iscariot went to the chief priests to betray his Lord,* 10. *They were glad, and gave him money,* 11. *The Lord prepared to eat the Passover,* 12—16. *While sitting at the paschal table, he told his disciples that one of them would deliver him up,* 17—21. *He instituted the Lord's supper,* 22—25. *The little company, after supper, went out to the Mount of Olives,* 26. *Our Lord told his disciples on the way that they would all be staggered in their faith that very night,* 27, 28. *Peter would not believe it, but was positive that he would rather die than waver,* 29. *His Lord told him that before the cock crowed twice that night, he would have denied him thrice,* 30, 31. *The Lord endures an overwhelming agony in Gethsemane; during which his*

---

the emulative cock-crowings in the stillness of the night, about midway between midnight and sunrise, is something quite startling to a stranger. ——*Or at morning*:—The watch that concluded with the sunrise.—It is dimly assumed that the master of the house will come *during night.* It is night, as it were, so long as he is away. (See *Cardinal Cajetan.*) Theophylact, however, dispels the charm of the parabolic scene, when he supposes the evening-time to be representative of old age, midnight of middle life, cock-crowing of manhood, and morning of the time of childhood.

VER. 36. *Lest he should come suddenly and find you sleeping*: Though it is night-time with the church, and the world, till the dayspring of Christ's universal epiphany, yet it is not time for sleeping. There is no time divinely allotted, or humanly required, for spiritual slumber and sleep. A-Lapide mentions that when Theophylact, the Commentator, was dying, he said, *Blessed are you, father Arsenus, for you always kept this hour in view.* (See *Evangel.* p. 451, ed. 1735.)

VER. 37. *But what I say to you, I say to all, Watch*:—The Saviour realized that he was not speaking to his apostles alone. He was speaking, through them, to the people of every generation and age. How vast the comprehension of his aim! How godlike the self-consciousness of his own commanding position in the very centre of universal humanity!

*disciples, though he had earnestly desired their sympathy, were overpowered with sleep,* 32—39. *By and by Judas came with a band from the chief priests, and the Lord suffered himself to be arrested and led off,* 40—53. *Peter followed,* 54. *Evidence was led against our Lord, but it broke down,* 55—59. *The High Priest then questioned him if He were the Christ, the Son of the blessed, and, when Jesus confessed it, he and his assessors condemned him as guilty of blasphemy,* 60—64. *Jesus was then cruelly maltreated,* 65. *Peter too denied him with oaths; but when the cock crowed twice, he was convicted in his conscience and repented,* 66—72.

AFTER two days was *the feast of* the passover, [a] Mat. 26. 2. Luke 22. 1. John 11. 55. John 12. 1. John 13. 1.

---

## CHAPTER XIV.

The last week of our Saviour's life on earth is drawing rapidly to a close. Two days more, and the last day will be reached,—the day of the consummation, the day when the typical passover-feast was to be enjoyed, and when the antitypical passover-Lamb was to be sacrificed. (See Matt. xxvi. 2.) Verses 1, 2 correspond in brief to Matt. xxvi, 1—5. So Luke xxii, 1, 2.

Ver. 1. *But after two days*:—It is probable that the triumphal entry into the city had been on Sunday, the 10th of the month Nisan, the day after the Jewish Sabbath. It would therefore be on Monday, the 11th, that the fig-tree was blighted, and the temple purified. Tuesday, the 12th, had been a peculiarly busy day, at once in the temple and on the mount. The prophecies of the preceding chapter had been delivered during the latter part of it. Wednesday and Thursday, the "two days" specified by the Evangelist, had yet to intervene, and then came '*Good* Friday,' the 15th of the month. (See Hanna's *Passion Week.*)——— *Was (the feast of) the passover and of unleavened bread*:—Literally, *was the Passover and the Unleavened.* A two-sided way of designating the chief of all the Jewish festivals. It was really but one and the same festival,—a week of festal days. But the elements of the prolonged festivity connected themselves, respectively, with the eating of the Paschal Lamb on the first of the seven festal days, and with the using of Unleavened Bread during the whole succession of holidays. Hence the twofold designation in Mark's phraseology. Luke combines the elements into unity, *the feast of the Unleavened, which is called the Passover,* (xxii, 1). Josephus, in his *Antiquities* (xiv, 2, 1), speaks correspondingly of "the festival of the Unleavened, which we call Phaska," or Passover. Phaska, *Paska,* or *Pascha,* is the Aramæic form of the Hebrew word *Pesach.* In his *Jewish War* (ii, 1, 3), the historian expresses himself thus,—"the festival of the Unleavened,—it is called Phascha by the Jews." The word *Passover* is a fine English translation of the Hebrew term. It properly denotes *the act of God in 'passing over'* the houses of the Hebrews on that night, in which he passed

and of unleavened bread: and the chief priests and the scribes sought how they might take him by craft, and put *him* to death.

---

through the land of Egypt and smote the first-born. (See Exod. xii, 12, 13.) But, as that gracious act was joyfully remembered by the people on the annual recurrence of the day on which it occurred, the day itself, and the whole connected week, and sometimes the specific supper, and sometimes also the paschal lamb itself, receive, respectively, the designation. The day, the supper, the lamb, were not literally the "Pass-over." They were the memorials of it. It is on the same principle that the bread and wine of the Lord's supper are not literally, even when "blessed," the body and blood of the Saviour, though so called in free sacramental phraseology. They are the memorials of the sacred realities. (See Harrison's *Answer to Dr. Pusey's Challenge*, chap. iv.) Instead of the fine word *Passover*, Tyndale and Coverdale, after Luther, give the heathen word *Easter*, and Wycliffe the Hebrew word *Pask*.—*The Unleavened*:-That is, *the Unleavened (Bread)*, or, more literally still, *the Unleavened (Things* or *Cakes*, ἄζυμα). The phrase is in two ways cut short,—for not only is the word *cakes* left out, the word *festival* is also omitted; *the festival of the Unleavened Cakes*. Those cakes, indeed, would in themselves be unadapted for sensuous festivity. They would not be so agreeable to the taste as leavened bread. They were "bread of affliction," (Deut. xvi, 3). But still they constituted an important element in the spiritual festivity of the occasion, for they were memorials, to the Hebrews, of the trying circumstances of their forefathers, when they could not afford time for the tedious process of leavening, but "baked unleavened cakes of the "dough which they brought forth out of Egypt: for it was not leavened, "because they were thrust out of Egypt, and could not tarry, neither had they "prepared for themselves any victual" (Exod. xii, 39). Rather unhappy, consequently, is the translation of Luther, Tyndale, Coverdale, and Amandus Polanus, *sweet bread*. Emser, in this, as in a few other cases, improved on Luther's version,—"the days of the unleavened cakes" *(der ungesaurten Brot)*. So Piscator, Zinzendorf, Bengel, Grynaus. And yet, as the German word for *leaven* is '*sour*-dough,' there is a semi-justification for Luther's translation.——*And the chief priests and the scribes*:-The leading men in the State, and thus the leading members of the Great Council of State or Sanhedrim.——*Sought*:-Or rather, *were seeking, were engaged in seeking*. It is the imperfect tense. The excitement occasioned by our Lord's appearances in the temple on the Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday, had put spurs into their malice. They were, before Wednesday, Thursday, and 'Good Friday,' busily engaged in concocting how they could get finally quit of such an impracticable Rabbi.—*Seeking*:-Desire, eagerness, effort, are implied.——*How they might lay hold of him by craft, and put him to death*:-They were afraid to seize him publicly, as he was the favourite of a large proportion of the unsophisticated people.—*By craft*:-By stratagem,—in the exercise of some kind of treachery (ἐν δόλῳ),—such as has so often been resorted to in the case of the followers of the Lord. Of Tyndale for instance, the noble English martyr and Bible-translator, who was basely entrapped in Antwerp by Philips, who pretended to be his friend, and who

2 But they said, Not on the feast *day*, lest there be an uproar of the people.

3 And being in Bethany in the house of Simon the leper,

---

acted his miscreant part "not without the help and procurement of some Bishops of this realm." (See Demaus's *William Tyndale*, p. 424.) Wycliffe's translation is, *with gile* (guile); Coverdale's *with disceate* (deceit). The same word is translated *subtilty* in Matt. xxvi, 4.

Ver. 2. *But they said* :–It is *For they said* in the manuscripts ℵBC*DL, as also in the Coptic version, and the margin of the Philoxenian-Syriac, and in a very large proportion of the Old-Latin codices. The *for* has been received into the text by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford : with reason,—as being by far the most difficult reading ; whereas *but* is the reading of Matt. xxvi, 5. Tregelles says that the Syriac-Peshito has no conjunction at all, (' ελεγον *tantum*'). But it has *and*. The *for* adduces the reason why they were just *seeking*, not *acting*.—*They said* :–The verb is in the imperfect. *They insisted on saying*.———*Not on the feast (day)* :–The supplement *day* is unhappy, for the *feast, festival*, or *festivity*, extended over seven days. It is, however, an old supplement. It is in the Vulgate, and hence in Wycliffe. In Erasmus too, and Tyndale, Coverdale, Castellio, and the Geneva. But not in Luther, Beza, Piscator, Sebastian Schmidt, or Erasmus Schmid,—*not in the festival*,—*not during the festival*.———*Lest there be* :–Or, *Lest there should be*. Very literally, and according to Greek idiom, *Lest there shall be*.———*An uproar of the people* :–A *riot*, a *tumult* (the Rheims and Geneva word). *Uproar* is a fine word, got by our translators from Coverdale, and suggested to him by Luther (*Aufruhr*). Wycliffe had *noyse;* Tyndale, still less happily, *business*.

Verses 3—9 constitute a paragraph or parcel, corresponding to Matt. xxvi, 6—13, and John xii, 1—8. It introduces another thread of things which got interwarped with what is recorded in the two preceding verses. It is probable that the narrative in Luke vii, 36—50, refers to a different, though somewhat kindred, occurrence. Events in common life frequently repeat themselves, *with variations*.

Ver. 3. *And while he was in Bethany* :–The precise chronological relationship is left indeterminate. In reality, however, as we learn from John's subsequent narrative, the evangelist steps backward a few days, to take up the thread that henceforward got intertwined with the action of the chief priests and scribes. See John xii, 1, 2.———*In the house of Simon the leper* :–Simon or Simeon was a common name among the Jews, and hence recourse was had to various expedients to differentiate any particular individual who required to be specified. The Simon in the case before us had been a leper, and may have been cured by our Lord. If he was presiding at his own table, his leprosy must have been removed, though the designation of his former unfortunate state stuck to him.———*As he sat at meat* :–More literally, *as he was reclining (at table)*. There is reference to the recumbent posture, which, in imitation of the Greeks and Romans, had been adopted for banquets by the Jews. (See Hi. Mercurialis *De Accubitus Origine.*)———*There came a woman* :–Her name is suppressed both by Mark and by Matthew. But we learn from John, that it was Mary, the sister of Martha and Lazarus, (xii, 2, 3). There may have been motives of

as he sat at meat, there came a [b] woman having an [b] Luke 7. 37.

---

prudence, or of delicacy, leading the earlier evangelists to veil the personality of the "woman."———*Having an alabaster box of ointment*:–There is no word for *box* in the original; and there is no reason to suppose that the vessel, in which the perfume was contained, would be of the nature or shape of a box. Doubtless *alabaster boxes* would be in use among ladies to hold their jewels, cosmetics, perfumes, and toilet etceteras; but it would, most probably, be in some kind of minute bottles that the volatile scents themselves would be kept. Hammond uses the word *cruise*. (Compare Petronius's phrase *nardi ampulla.*) The expression in the original is simply, *having an alabaster of ointment.* Pliny expressly says that *perfumes are best preserved in alabasters.* The vessel, because made of alabaster, was called *an alabaster*, just as, with ourselves, a particular garment, because made of waterproof-stuff, is called *a waterproof.* And a small glass-vessel for drinking out of is called, generically, *a glass.* Herodotus (iii, 20), uses the identical expression employed by the evangelist. He says that the Ichthyophagi were sent by Cambyses to the Ethiopians "bearing, as gifts, a purple cloak, a golden necklace, bracelets, *an alabaster of perfume*, and a cask of palm wine."—*Perfume*: Or *balsam* as it were, or *otto* or *âtar.* ———*Of spikenard*:–If the *of* be retained, then the word *spikenard* will be regarded as literally in the 'whence-case,' and as denoting the plant from which the essential scent was obtained. If the *of* be dispensed with, and a comma substituted in its place, then the word *nard* will be in simple apposition with *ointment*, as denoting, not the plant from which it was obtained, but the specific kind of perfume. We are disposed to take this latter view. So Robert Stephens, Henry Stephens, Beza, Mill, Wetstein, Schottgen, Griesbach, Vater.—*Spikenard*:–Certainly a wrong translation, though not involving error of any serious consequence, even in a botanical point of view. The original expression is just, as Jeremy Taylor reproduces it (*Works*, iii, *p.* 272, *ed.* 1839) without any attempt at translation, *nard pistic*, (νάρδου πιστικῆς). So too Erasmus. What this word *pistic* means, is the question in dispute, and has much exercised the ingenuity, and stimulated the research of critics. The Latins, from the earliest period, were puzzled by the word. A considerable number of the codices of the Old-Latin version just reproduce the Greek term, as Erasmus and Jeremy Taylor do, *(nardi pistici).* But as this was quite unintelligible to Latin ears, the expression was, by a slight modification *(nardi spicati)*, changed in other copies into *bearded nard*, or *spiked nard*, that is *spikenard.* This modified term was retained in the Vulgate. Hence Wycliffe's version, *spicanard;* and the Rheims, *spike-narde;* and the Geneva, and our Authorized Version. It is defended as the probable original form of the word by Castellio, Grotius, Hammond, Wetstein. Unreasonably. Augustin supposed that the evangelist's word must have reference to some place—unknown to him—"whence the precious ointment was obtained," and he conjectured that this topographical reference was specified by the evangelist, because the name recalled, in a mystic or "sacramental" way, the idea of *pistis* or *faith.* (*Tract. in Johannem*, xii, 3.) John Hartung of Friburg crowned the conjecture of Augustin by supposing that the term had suffered elision in the hands of transcribers, who were ignorant of Oriental geography, and that, as it came

alabaster box of ointment of [1]spikenard very preci-

[1] Or, *pure nard*, or, *liquid nard.*

from the pen of the evangelist, it was *Opistic*,—the reference being to *Opis*, a place in the vicinity of Babylon. Scultet was charmed with this fancy of Hartung's, and declared that it entirely superseded all the disputations of theologians, botanists, and grammarians on the term. (*Observationes in Matt. et Marc.* c. lxxx.) Petter too inclined to it. But there is no trace of *Opistic* in either manuscripts or versions; and, though there were, the adjective would have had a different conformation if the reference had been to Opis. Joseph Scaliger, always fertile in ingenuities, had—as Nansius, the teacher of Gerard Jo. Vossius, reports—another conjecture, emendative of the word. (Vossii *Harm. Ev.* I, iii, § 9.) He supposed that it should be *ptistic*, and that the entire expression meant *perfume of 'pounded' nard*. But this too is a mere and impracticable guess. A considerable number of eminent critics have supposed that the word must be derived from πίω=πίνω, *to drink*, or, as Fritzsche contends, from πιπίσκω, *to give to drink*, and that its meaning is either *potable*, strictly so speaking, or, more generically, *liquid*. This supposition has been approved of by the lexicographers Henry Stephens, Pasor, Fischer, Schleusner, Schneider, Passow, Liddell-and-Scott; and likewise by Casaubon in his Notes, and by Beza, Maldonat, Felbinger, Erasmus Schmid, Sebastian Schmidt, and others. Fritzsche, in particular, contends strongly for it, and adduces good evidence to show that nard was really 'potable,' and sometimes drunk. The word *pistic*, however, never occurs in Greek writers, with the meaning contended for; not even in Eusebius *Dem. Evan.* ix, 439. And although it did occur with such a signification, it would seem strange that the nard's potability should be specified here, as the perfume was not mixed by Mary, with the Saviour's wine, but poured upon his person. What then? Is there any other more likely interpretation of the term? There is. The word occurs in both Xenophon (*Cyrop.* I, vi, 10) and Plato (*Opera*, vol. iv, 21, *Bipont.*) with the signification, *persuasive*, or *producing persuasion*. In later writers, such as Plutarch, Artemidorus, and Cedrenus, the idea of *persuasion* passed over to that of *faith* or *trust*, and the word is used as meaning *producing faith* or *trust*. Artemidorus, for instance, in the Second Book of his *Oneirocritica* (ch. 33) speaks of "a wife, who is rich, *trusty* (πιστικήν), and a keeper at home, and obedient to her husband,"—*trusty, trustworthy*, or, as viewed from a slightly varied standpoint, *faithful*. Things, however, may be *trustworthy* as well as persons; and no doubt the *nard* referred to by the evangelist was a *pistic* thing—in the sense of being *trustworthy*, that is, *genuine, pure, unadulterated*. Heumann supposes that this might be a *plebeian* use of the word *pistic*. But Le Clerc seems nearer the mark when he suggests that it would probably be the term that was used *in the trade* to denote the genuine article. Such too was Winer's opinion (*Grammar*, p. 110). And we know from Pliny's *Natural History* (xii, 26), that there was, as might have been expected, an "adulterated" article in circulation, which he calls *pseudonard*. Theophylact gives this meaning of *unadulterated* as an alternative explanation of the term: he says "understand by *pistic nard* either a kind of nard so called, *or the genuine nard, faithfully prepared*, (τὴν ἄδολον νάρδον καὶ

ous; and she brake the box, and poured *it* on his head.

---

μετὰ πίστεως κατασκευασθεῖσαν). The interpretation is approved of by Faber, Luther, Tyndale, Coverdale, Kypke, Bengel, Michaelis, Heumann, De Wette, Bleek, Ewald, Meyer, Lange, Volkmar. It is also approved of by the Lexicographers, Parkhurst, Bretschneider, Wahl, Robinson, Schirlitz, Grimm. Otto too and Eckard, in their respective *Dissertations* on the expression, support it. And it is supported, likewise, by the Syriac-Peshito version, in which the phrase is rendered freely by an expression which means *the principal* or *best nard*. (See Reusch.)———*Nard*:-A word, which, though in common use among the Greeks, was not of Greek origin. It was used too by the Hebrews (Cant. i, 12; iv, 13, 14), but was not a native of their language either, or of any of the Semitic tongues. It had no doubt come from the farther east; but from what part is still uncertain. Sir William Jones mentions, on the authority of a Dr. Anderson of Madras, that "in the Tamul dictionary most words beginning with *nár* have some relation to fragrance." But, adds Sir William, "I have not met with any such root in Sanscrit; and in Persian, which has a manifest affinity with it, *nár* means a *pomegranate* and *nárgil* a *cocoa-nut*, neither of which have any remarkable fragrance." (*The Spikenard of the Ancients*: Works, vol. v, *p.* 27.) Sir William says that "it seems clear that the Greeks used the foreign word *nard*, generically, for odoriferous plants of different natural orders," (*p.* 37). He was led, however, in consequence of our Authorized translation of the term, to concentrate his researches upon *spikenard*, which certainly may have been the *genuine nard* which Mary lavished on her Lord, although the evangelist does not say that it was. Sir William Jones concludes thus,—"My own inquiries "having convinced me that the Indian spikenard of Dioscorides is the "*Sumbulu'l Hind*, and that the *Sumbulu'l Hind* is the *Jatámánsi* of "Amarsinh, I am persuaded that the true nard is a species of *Valerian*, "produced in the most remote and hilly parts of India, such as Népál, "Morang, and Butan, near which Ptolemy fixes its native soil," (*p.* 44.) —As to the construction of the adjective *very-precious*, or rather *very-expensive*, *very-costly*, we may either leave it appositively by the side of the expression *genuine nard*, or transpositively connect it thus,—*very-costly genuine nard*. This latter we prefer.———*And she brake the alabaster*:-Probably in the way of striking off the narrow neck, or such part of it as had been tightly and hermetically plugged and sealed to prevent evaporation and unlawful abstraction. She would bring it sharply in contact with some hard substance at hand, (συντρίψασα). To suppose, with Hammond and Alford, that the vessel was entirely *shattered*, or "crushed in the hand," is to introduce incongruities of imagination. Fritzsche specifies them naively thus,—"probable injury to the hand of Mary, possible injury to the Saviour's head, and plashing of the nard on the floor."———*And poured* (it) *on his head*:-As an "oil of gladness." It is better to omit the supplementary *it*. Very literally, the clause would run thus, *poured-down him, down the head*. In Greek idiom, as well as in English, we can speak either of *pouring-down a person*, or of *pouring-down upon a person*. In the reading of ℵBCLΔ, 1,—received by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford,—the detached preposition is omitted,—*poured-down his head*. It seems a more elegant phrase; but for that very reason we should scarcely expect that

4 And there were [c]some that had indignation within themselves, and said, Why was this waste of the ointment made? 5 For it might have been sold for more than three hundred [2]pence, and have been given to

[c] Mat. 26. 8. John 12. 4.

[2] See Mat. 18. 28.

---

it would, if genuine, have been disturbed and transformed into the more repetitious and inartificial expression of the Received Text.

VER. 4. *And there were some that had indignation* :–A peculiar and very expressive word in the original (ἀγανακτοῦντες). They felt as if *full of aches.*—*Some* :–A veil is drawn over the personalities. But we learn from Matt. xxvi, 8, that it was the "disciples" themselves whose equanimity had been disturbed. The more shame to them. And, from John xii, 4, we learn that the centre and the source of the 'cantankerous' disturbance was Judas Iscariot. "Just like him."———*Within themselves* :–More literally, *to* or *toward themselves*, that is, *to* or *toward the individuals of their own circle,—to* or *toward one another.* The expression implies that, instead of bottling up '*within themselves,*' and burying, the aching fretting grudging feelings, of which they were conscious, they *turned to one another*, and gave expression to them.———*And said* :–These words are not found in the manuscripts ℵBC*L, and may not improbably have been absent from the evangelist's autograph. They can be mentally supplied with ease. Had they occurred, indeed, before the clause *to one another*, their omission from the manuscripts specified might have been accounted for on the principle of similar endings of short lines, (*Homoioteleuton.* See the Sinaitic MS.) But as they are found after '*to one another,*' their accidental omission is not so easily accounted for, while their deliberate insertion on the part of some transcriber, who wished to smoothe the phraseology, need occasion no surprise. ———*Why was this waste of the ointment made?*–Or, *To what end has this destruction of the perfume been made?* They speak of the perfume as having been *destroyed,*—not thinking, in their censorious zeal, that if it should ever be used at all, it must be evaporated. *To what end?* They were blind, meanwhile, to the very end which the All-wise Creator intended in the creation of such sweet perfumes? Why should they not be enjoyed? If enjoyed by others, why not by our Lord? Why should not Mary have the joy of ministering to the joy of her Saviour? Could "the oil of gladness" be more worthily employed?

VER. 5. *For it* :–Or rather, as it is in the best manuscripts and ancient versions, *for this ointment.* All the modern editors, inclusive of Griesbach and Scholz, have accepted the reading.———*Might have been sold* :–Or *could have been sold.* Very literally, *was able to be sold.*———*For more than three hundred pence* :–Literally, *for over three hundred denarii.* The *denarius*, or *silver penny*, was the standard silver coin of the Romans, larger than a sixpence and smaller than a shilling. Three hundred denarii would be about £10 sterling,—a very large sum in those days.———*And given to the poor* :–True; and it was also true that the individual who might be supposed to buy it, could, instead of buying it, give his money to the poor. Must he not buy it then? Must no one buy it? And must the poor cease to cull the plant, and prepare the perfume, that it may be sold to the rich? Must there be nothing used in life, but the barest and most absolute necessaries? Must all fine arts and elegancies be abolished? It is evident that the grumblers were taking extremely narrow views of what is

the poor. And they murmured against her. 6 And Jesus said, Let her alone; why trouble ye her? she hath wrought a good work on me. 7 For [d] ye have the poor with you always, and whensoever ye will ye may do them good: but me ye have not always. 8 She hath done what she could: she is come aforehand to anoint my body to the

[d] Deut. 15. 11.

---

good for human society in general, and for the poor in particular.——*And they murmured against her*: It is a most expressive word in the original, (ἐνεβριμῶντο,—and suggests something stronger than *murmuring*. There was a kind of *rumble-grumble muttering*, bursting out into something like a suppressed howl or growl. The word recalls the hoarse dissonant sounds emitted by fretted beasts.

VER. 6. *But Jesus said, Let her alone; why trouble ye her?*—Or, as the Rheims admirably renders it, *Why do ye molest her?* Our Lord's spirit rose up against their rasping censoriousness.——*She hath wrought a good work on me*:—Or literally, *She wrought a good work in me.*—*She wrought*:—Namely, in the act that is past.—*A good work*: Very literally, *a beautiful work*. There was beautiful propriety in it.—*In me*: Such is the reading of all the uncial manuscripts without exception, and hence of all the modern editors. The reading in the Received Text must have been simply borrowed from Matt. xxvi, 10. The expression *in me* represents the Saviour's person as the sphere in which the beautiful work was performed.

VER. 7. *For ye have the poor with you always, and whensoever ye will ye may do them good*:—Literally, *ye are able to do good to them*. You will have plenty of opportunities for your charities.——*But me ye have not always*: The Saviour was looking steadfastly to the crisis that was imminent, and wished to direct, in an indefinite way, the minds of his disciples and other auditors, to the same 'coming event.' Any trifle of expenditure, therefore, that might be lavished on him, during the few remaining hours of his career, would abstract but little indeed from the sum-total of the resources that might be available for the poor.

VER. 8. *She hath done what she could*:—Literally, *she did what she had*, that is, *she did what she had to do,—what she had it in her power to do.* A noble eulogium;—the noblest possible. We are not responsible for not doing what we have it not in our power to do. But to do up to the measure of our power,—that is Christian perfection.——*She is come aforehand to anoint*:—Or rather, *she anticipated to anoint*,—that is, *she anticipatively anointed*, or *embalmed* as it were, though not in the Egyptian way. See John xix, 40. The custom of embalming rested on a principle of hope for the future, and indicated emphatically that endearment did not cease with life. (See the fine dissertation of Faselt *De Unctura Christi Sepulchrali.*)——*My body*:—The Saviour's thoughts have gone forward beyond his decease. He is thinking of his lifeless body.——*To the burying*:—Or *for the entombment* (εἰς τὸν ἐνταφιασμόν),—'*the*' *entombment that is to take place*. The Saviour knew that he was to die according to the Scriptures, *and to be buried*, and to rise again the third day according to the Scriptures. In *his* mind, therefore, the action of the loving woman was connected with his death and consequent burial.

burying. 9 Verily I say unto you, Wheresoever this gospel shall be preached throughout the whole world, *this* also that she hath done shall be spoken of for a memorial of her.

10 And [e] Judas Iscariot, one of the twelve, went [e] Mat. 26. 14. Luke 22. 3.

---

And in *her* mind, too, when, under the folds of her explicit faith, gratitude, and devotedness, we reach the substrate of what was implicit. We come to a point whereher anointing connected itself, in a spirit at once of holy hope and true devotedness, with all that was essential for human salvation. It connected itself therefore with "the entombment."

VER. 9. *And verily I say to you*:–The *and* (δέ) is found in a large proportion of the uncial manuscripts, inclusive of ℵBDEGKL.—*Verily I say to you*:–That is, *I solemnly assure you.*———*Wheresoever this gospel shall be preached*:–*This Gospel, of which we have been speaking at this table this evening, and which has to do with my death, burial, and resurrection.* It is noteworthy, however, that in the Sinaitic, Vatican, and Cambridge manuscripts (ℵBD), as also in L and 69, the expression is simply *the Gospel.* And this is the reading given by Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford. With reason apparently,—the 'Received Reading' being borrowed from Matt. xxvi, 13, where it is genuine.———*Throughout the whole world*:–Literally, *into the whole world.* The phraseology is abrupt and condensed. The idea is, *wheresoever the gospel shall be proclaimed by my heralds, as they go 'into' the whole world.* See chap. xvi, 15; and compare, for the [illegible]ression, chap. xiii, 16. Principal Campbell's translation is free, but mode of exp[illegible] —*in whatsoever corner of the world the Gospel shall be* not remarkably elegant, [illegible]*shall be spoken of*:–More literally, *preached.*———*This also that she hath done* [illegible]her doings indeed shall *That also which this (woman) did shall be spoken of.* Ou[illegible] be prominent,—the doings of Another. But the deed of this woman shall not be overlooked. It shall be *rehearsed*, as Tyndale has it; or *told*, as it is in Wycliffe, Coverdale, and the Rheims; or *mentioned*, as Mace and Principal Campbell give it.———*For a memorial of her*: That is, to preserve the memory of her among men. Compare Acts x, 4. The word used (μνημόσυνον) is connected with *Mnemosyné*, the Mother of the Muses, and so called because, before the invention of writing, a capacious and tenacious *memory* was a prime prerequisite in every effort of literary genius.

Verses 10 and 11 form a little paragraph concerning Judas, the betrayer, corresponding to Matt. xxvi, 14—16, and Luke xxii, 3—6.

VER. 10. *And*:–This conjunction indicates that what follows is a thread of things that should be taken up in connection with what goes before. There was even a closer connection than is apparent on the surface of Mark's narrative. Compare John xii, 3—7.———*Judas Iscariot*:–See chapter iii, 19. The great drawbacks to every good cause on earth are—(1) the imperfections of the good workers; and (2) the ultroneous presence and poisonous influence of workers who are not good.———*One of the twelve*:–This expression would possibly get attached to the Traitor's name in society at large. When man told to man the sensational news regarding the arrest and execution of the Great Galilean Rabbi, who, with his twelve humble disciples, was 'turning' the Jewish world 'upside down,' it would be said that he was sold and betrayed to the chief priests by *Judas Iscariot, 'one of the twelve.'* Why did our Lord, it may be

unto the chief priests, to [f] betray him unto them. [f] John 13. 2.
11 And when they heard *it,* they were glad, and promised to give him [g] money. And he sought how he might [g] 1 Ki. 21. 20. 1 Tim. 6. 10.
conveniently betray him.

12 And the first day of unleavened bread, [h] when [h] Ex. 12. 6.
they [2] killed the passover, his disciples said unto him, [2] Or, *sacrificed.*

---

asked, admit him into the number? The man, we imagine, would be honest when admitted. And though he might not be noble, yet our Lord had to accept, not the best that were conceivable, but the best that were available.——— *We[nt] to the chief priests*:—*Went off* privately from Bethany, that very night, [im]mediately, on which he had been checked by our Lord for his petty and illiberal [ap]parent[ly] g in reference to the perfume.———*To betray him unto them*:—Or, *in* [gr]umblin[g] *e might deliver him over to them.* His temper was 'up.' And, as *order that* [h]e s now habitually speaking of imminent and ignominious death, he his Master wa[s] think that it was not prudent to be attached to a "losing perhaps began to [be] he not, therefore, get out of it without delay, and if possible concern." Should [he] pocket? with something in his [hand] *n they heard it, were glad, and promised to give him* Ver. 11. *But they, when* [th]em. The thirty pieces of silver, spoken of in Matt. *money*:—Probably a large sum [pro]id to him (see *Comment.* in loc.), were probably xxvi, 15, as then and there pa[id] pidity, and spur him on to go through with only a sum in hand to whet his co[n]m that time *he set about seeking* (ἐζήτει),— his treason.———*And he sought*:—Fr[om] ———*How he might conveniently deliver* he applied his mind to mature a plan.—[By] means *opportunely,* (εὐκαίρως). He *him up*: The word rendered *conveniently* [im]good opportunity that occurred, began to plot how he might improve the first [to work out his dark plot, to deliver up his Lord.

Verses 12—16. The evangelist leaves the Traitor [Judas] and here takes up another thread of events,—our Lord['s personal preparation for celebrating the paschal supper. See, as corresponding [in] paragraphs, Matt. xxvi, 17—19, and especially Luke xxii, 7—13.

Ver. 12. *And on the first day of the Unleavened*: That is, *of the Unleavened (cakes),* or, in the singular, *of the Unleavened (bread).* The day referred to,—the 14th of the month Abib or Nisan (Ex. xii, 6)—was only in a loose and popular sense, *the first day* of the festival. It was strictly *the preparation day,* when all arrangements had to be completed for the commencement of the festivities, immediately after sunset. As, however, these arrangements were, so to speak, the inception of the festivities, the day was sometimes, as here, spoken of as the first day of the festival. Hence in Josephus's *Antiquities* ii, 15, 1, we read,—"we keep a feast for *eight days,* which is called the feast of the Unleavened," while in the same *Antiquities* iii, 10, 5, he says, "the feast of the Unleavened falls on the fifteenth day of the month, and continues *seven days.*" In the one case the historian freely attached the preparation day to the sacred days, and thus made *eight days.* In the other he spoke strictly of the sacred days, and hence numbered them *seven.* If our Lord's decease be reckoned as having happened in the 29th year of the Christian era, as now calculated, then the day referred to here, the 14th of the month Nisan, would fall on the 16th of March, A.D. 29. (See Patrizi, *De Evangeliis,* lib. ii, p. 423).———*When they*

Where wilt thou that we go and prepare that thou mayest eat
the passover? 13 And he sendeth forth two of his disciples,
and saith unto them, [i] Go ye into the city, and there [i] Chap. 11. 2.
shall meet you a man bearing a pitcher of water: John 21. 17.
follow him. 14 And wheresoever he shall go in, say ye to
the goodman of the house, [j] The Master saith, Where [j] John 11. 28.
John 13. 13.

---

*killed the passover*:–For it was needful that the paschal lamb,—which was to be eaten on the 15th, immediately after the setting of the sun on the 14th,—should be killed on the 14th "between the two evenings," that is, after the 9th hour of the solar day, but before the conclusion of the 12th, or between 3 and 6 o'clock in the afternoon. See Ex. xii, 6; Lev. xxiii, 5, 6; Numb. xxviii, 16, 17; xxxiii, 3.—*When they killed*:–The verb is in the imperfect tense, and here means *when they were wont to kill.*—*To kill*:–Namely, in a sacred way, or *sacrificially.* Hence the appropriate translation of the word in 1 Cor. v, 7, "Christ our Passover, is *sacrificed* for us." In the passage before us too, it is rendered *sacrificed* in the Geneva, and the Rheims,—and by Calvin too in his French version, and Wakefield and Principal Campbell. The Vulgate has *immolated;* Luther, *offered.* The lambs were killed in the temple, either by the owners, or by the Levites, (2 Chron. xxx, 17). The blood would be received by the Levites, and then handed to the priests to be sprinkled (2 Chron. xxxv, 11).—*The passover*:–That is, *the lamb which was the memorial of the historic passover.* The thing commemorating gets the name of the thing commemorated.———*His disciples say to him, Where wilt thou that we go, and prepare, in order that thou mayest eat the passover?*–Note the reverential feeling that dominated the disciples. They did not say, *in order that 'we' may eat the passover.* They hid themselves behind their Lord.

Ver. 13. *And he sendeth off two of his disciples*:–They were Peter and John. See Luke xxii, 8.———*And saith to them, Go into the city, and there shall meet you a man bearing a pitcher of water*:–Showing, by that servile act, that the day was not strictly *a holy day.* There is a kind of emphasis on the word *man.* It was women in general who carried home,—poised on their heads,—the earthenware pitchers, pots, or 'cans' of water, which needed to be replenished for domestic use. There might be many of these veiled females wending their respective ways through the streets, at the time that the two disciples would be entering the city. A considerable supply of water would be requisite for the holidays. But the disciples were to look out for *a man* thus engaged,—no doubt, *a serving-man* in some 'hostelry' or 'hospice.'———*Follow him*:–Our Lord's instructions rested on his infallible prevision.

Ver. 14. *And wheresoever he shall enter*:–Into whatsoever house he shall enter, enter ye too, and then act as I tell you.———*Say to the goodman of the house*:–Literally, *to the master of the house*, or, as Wycliffe has it, *to the lord of the hous.*—The expression *goodman*, as used by Tyndale and preserved in our Authorized Version, is a relic of an olden time, when the heads of a household establishment expressed to one another, in their habitual intercourse, their mutual esteem. In some parts of the country the custom still lingers, and husbands and wives address each other as *goodman*, *goodwife*. The goodness was sometimes regarded as transferred to the house. Over the door of some of

is the guestchamber, where I shall eat the passover with my disciples? 15 And he will shew you a large upper room furnished *and* prepared: there make ready for us.

---

the houses of the ancient Egyptians, the inscription was occasionally put—"the good house." (Wilkinson's *Ancient Egypt*, vol. i, p. 6.)———*The Master saith*:–Literally *the Teacher*, that is, *the Rabbi*. We may reasonably suppose that *the goodman of the house* would know the Saviour, and would have such a knowledge of the disciples too that the expression *the Rabbi* would be enough to determine for him who was meant.———*Where is the guestchamber, where I may eat the passover with my disciples?*–The word (κατάλυμα), freely translated *guest-chamber* by Tyndale, and condemned altogether by Thomas Magister (under καταγώγιον), properly means, when spoken by a Jew or other Oriental, a *khan* or *caravanserai* where travellers *untied* their travelling 'traps' or equipages, and got rest for their beasts of burden and themselves. It is translated *inn* in Luke ii, 7. "Caravanserais are generally built of the most solid and "durable materials; have commonly only one story above the ground floor, the "lower of which is arched, and serves for warehouses to store goods, and for "stables, while the upper is appropriated to lodgings. A fountain is commonly "in the centre of the open quadrangle, and itinerant cookshops are found nigh "at hand to supply the wants of travellers. The lodging chambers are often "little better than cells, where the visitor finds nothing else than bare walls, "dust, and sometimes scorpions. The traveller must bring with him his bed, "and not unfrequently his cooking utensils and provender." (*Rays from the East*, p. 39.) The establishment in Jerusalem, to which the disciples were directed, would be conducted on more accommodating principles, especially at Passover-time, when there would be such demand for accommodation. See next verse. The word used by the evangelist was applicable, it would appear, either to the entire establishment, or to a particular apartment within it, which would be indeed but a miniature of the whole. Each was *a resting-place* or *lodging-place*. The Rheims translates it *refectorie*, the Geneva *lodging*, and Wycliffe, picturesquely and alternatively, *fulfilling or eating place*,—a place where people might *eat* till *filled full*.

VER. 15. *And he will shew you a large upper room*:–Literally *a large upper place*, or *a place raised above the ground* (ἀνάγαιον = ἀνώγαιον). It might be a whole flat, or it might be a single chamber in a flat. Here it was the latter. It needed to be relatively large, however, as it was to accommodate not merely two or three, but thirteen.———*Furnished*:–Literally *strown*, or as Wycliffe has it *strewid*, namely, *with couches round a table*. The couches were *strewed* or '*strawed*,' ready for convivial use. The rooms in caravanserais were generally unfurnished. But this was prepared for the passover-feast. Luther, Tyndale, and Coverdale misunderstood the word. They rendered it *paved*, (Luther, *gepflastert*). The Geneva too was off the scent, *trimmed*.———*Ready*:–Already swept, and clean, and in order for the feast. Even at the present day the very humblest Jewish family generally has, at the Passover-time, "the walls of the house whitewashed, the floor scrubbed, the "furniture cleaned, and all things made to put on a new appearance." (Mills' *British Jews*, p. 195.)———*There make ready for us*:–It is *And*

16 And his disciples went forth, and came into the city, and found as he had said unto them: and they made ready the passover.

17 And in the evening he cometh with the twelve. 18 And as they sat and did eat, Jesus said, Verily I say unto you, One of you which [k]eateth with me shall betray me.

[k] Ps. 41. 9. Ps. 55. 13.

---

*there* in ℵBCDL, and in the Vulgate, Coptic, Gothic, and Æthiopic versions.

VER. 16. *And the disciples went forth*:–Literally, *went out*, namely from the place where the Lord and the rest of them were remaining.———*And came into the city, and found as he said to them, and made ready the passover*:–That is, they got the paschal lamb, took it to the temple to be there killed, so that its blood might be sprinkled by the priests. Then taking it to the caravanserai, they engaged themselves in getting it cooked, and in providing all the etceteras of the feast, such as the unleavened cakes, bitter herbs, wine, and the water that was required for baptismal purification. At the present day, in Britain, the Jews are still punctiliously particular in making preparation on the same day for the feast. They provide for themselves unleavened cakes, made under the supervision of the chief Rabbi, and all the other etceteras specified. But instead of the literal paschal lamb, they have only, on a representative principle, a bone having a small bit of meat adhering, which is roasted brown on the coals. Along with this they have, in the same dish, as supplementary to the bone, an egg roasted hard in hot ashes. This is intended to signify that the lamb was to be roasted whole. (Mills' *British Jews*, p. 196.) The company all "lay hold of the dish;" and the evening is turned into the principal festivity of the year.

VERSES 17—21 correspond to Matthew xxvi, 20—25 and Luke xxii, 14, 21—23. The shadows are thickening around our Lord.

VER. 17. *And in the evening*:–Or, *and when evening came;* very literally, *when evening became.* The reference is to the *later evening* of the Jews,—the evening that set in with the setting of the sun.———*He cometh with the twelve*:–After the two deputed brethren had finished their preparations, and were ready to leave the lamb roasting in its earthenware or excavated oven, they would doubtless return to their master, and the whole company would thereafter walk together to Jerusalem. The city and the entire neighbourhood would be tremulously astir as the sun went down.

VER. 18. A space of time intervenes, and many little incidents occurred, but a veil is drawn over them. The evangelist touches only on some salient points, which were relevant to his practical purpose.———*And while they were reclining (at the table), and eating, Jesus said, Verily I say to you*:–That is, *I do solemnly assure you.*———*One of you, who eateth with me, shall deliver me up*:–His heart was full. It was a feast of holy gratitude and gladness, which they were celebrating and enjoying,—a feast too of mutual love. And yet a traitor's heart was present, and a traitor's hand was partaking. The existence of such treason was a burden on the Saviour's spirit, and a bar to free fellowship.

19 And they began to be sorrowful, and to say unto him one by one, *Is* it I? and another *said, Is* it I? 20 And he answered and said unto them, *It is* one of the twelve, that

---

VER. 19. *And they began to be sorrowful*:–The true-hearted disciples had, no doubt, been disposed before to be joyful on the joyful occasion. But a dark cloud now flung its shadow o'er their spirits.———*And to say to him, one by one, Is it I?*–The question is of such a nature (μήτι ἐγώ;) that the expectation of a negative reply is carried in its breast,—*Surely it is not I?*———*And another* said, *Is it I?*–The supplementary *said* should be omitted. It interferes with the construction,—*they began to say, first one and then another, Is it I? and another, Is it I?* The evangelist's expression is not punctiliously trimmed. He first goes over the whole company summarily, '*one by one;*' and then, as if he had merely commenced the enumeration and said '*one,*' he proceeds to specify '*another.*' Schulz says correctly that the clause, '*and another, Is it I?*' is not needed after the expression '*one by one, Is it I?*' And so have the writers of some of the earliest manuscripts thought; for the clause is wanting in ℵBCLPΔ, as also in the Vulgate, Syriac-Peshito, Coptic, Armenian, and Æthiopic versions, and in the text of the Philoxenian-Syriac. It is condemned also as spurious by Erasmus, Beza, Grotius, Mill, Fritzsche. Tregelles omits it from his Text. And so has Tischendorf in his 8th edition. Volkmar too rejects it. And yet *it must no doubt be genuine;* for, while there was strong temptation, on the ground of concinnity of composition, to reject it, there would be none to insert it. It bears the mark of a true Markism. It is found in the Alexandrine and Cambridge manuscripts (AD), as also of WbXΠ, and other eight uncials. It is found too in the majority of the Old-Latin codices, as also in the margin of the Philoxenian-Syriac. And Origen, in collating Matthew's representation and Mark's, expressly gives it, (*Opera*, iv, p. 436). Griesbach approved of it in his *Critical Commentary*. Lachmann retained it. So did Alford. And Meyer and Lange acquiesce.

VER. 20. *And he answered and said to them*:–The word *answered*, though undoubtedly genuine in Matt. xxvi, 23, is omitted here in the oldest manuscripts and versions, and hence is left out by the modern editors.———*One of the twelve, that dippeth with me in the dish*:–There is emotional abruptness in the appositive expressions. A shower of questions *Is it I?* had fallen around our Lord. He paused deliberately, and then said, *One of the twelve,—(One) who dippeth with me in the dish.* It is as if he had said, *He belongs to my own little band; and he partakes of my hospitality, as if he were animated with the kindliest feelings!—Dippeth*:–There would be frequent dippings. But perhaps there was a simultaneous dipping at the time that our Lord uttered the words before us. Besides the roasted lamb, there would probably be other viands "sodden" (2 Chron. xxxv, 13), and swimming. There would at all events be some liquid preparations into which the hands would be dipped either with or without bread. Such dipping, in lieu of forks on the one hand and of spoons on the other, is still a common custom in the East.—*In the dish*:–Literally, *into*. The conveyance of the hand *into* the vessel is depicted. The nature of the vessel or terreen is not now determinable. Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale have *platter*. It is the Rheims that supplied our translators with the word *dish*.

dippeth with me in the dish. 21 The Son of man indeed goeth, as it is written of him: but woe to that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! [l] good were it for that man if he had never been born.

[l] Mat. 18. 6.

---

Ver. 21. *The Son of man indeed goeth*:–*Departs, withdraws from this terrestrial scene of things.* The reference is of course to death. In the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts (ℵB), as also in L, and in the Sahidic and Coptic versions, there is, at the commencement of this clause, the conjunction *because* (ὅτι). It has been received into the text by Tischendorf and Alford, and is probably genuine. In the Vulgate, most of the Old-Latin codices, as also in the Peshito-Syriac, and the Philoxenian-Syriac, there is, instead, the conjunction *and*,—supplanting apparently the more difficult *because*. Comp. Luke xxii, 22. The Saviour is not strictly giving a reason for the base act of treason to which he has referred. But he is giving a reason for the divine permission of such an act. It would have been easy to have prevented, by a miracle, the flagrant deed. But such prevention was not thought of, for a victim's death, as an offering for the sins of the world, was really contemplated by the Divine Mind.———*As it is written of him*:–Literally, *as it has been written concerning him.* For instance in the 22d Psalm, and the 53d chapter of Isaiah, and in the whole sacrificial symbolism of the Old Testament economy.———*But woe to that man by whom the Son of man is delivered up*:–There is a sound of *wailing* in the *woe*. Compare the use of the word in the only other case in which it occurs in Mark, chap. xiii, 17. It is translated *alas* in Rev. xviii, 10, 16, 19. Reprobation and increpation are indeed implied; but lamentation is expressed.———*Good were it for that man if he had never been born*:–More literally, *Good would it be for him, if that man were not born.* As for the potential import of the substantive verb, *would it be*, see Clyde's *Syntax*, § 43. The apophthegm is rather remarkable when microscopically examined, for, strictly speaking, nothing would be *good* to a man who never existed. But our Saviour's meaning is not microscopic but obvious and most solemn,—*A man's existence is turned into a curse to him, when he inverts the grand moral purpose contemplated in its divine origination.* But was not Judas's treason indispensable, and also the murderous action of the Jews and the Gentiles? God forbid! Dr. Beard says,—"Whatever God may "have appointed, Judas committed a great crime. And the Jews were "murderers in the most unmitigated sense of the term. I present an illustra- "tion: A man is condemned to death; a regular infliction of the punish- "ment would not be murder; but when the day of execution arrives, an "impatient and vindictive mob turns aside the course of law and takes the "work into its own hands. Death is the result; but was the agency of "the mob necessary to the end? Did it make any part of the original "appointment?"—"I cannot make the admission that sin is necessary to "any good, great or small."—"God did appoint the Saviour to sufferings "and death for sin. But I insist that God did not appoint the particular "agencies which employed themselves in the transaction, nor the manner "in which those agencies acted." (*Lectures on Theology*, vol. iii, pp. 382—3.)

Verses 22—25 contain an account of the institution of the New Testament

22 [m]And as they did eat, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake *it*, and gave to them, and said,

[m] Mat. 26. 26. Luke 22. 19. 1 Cor. 11. 23.

---

Passover-feast,—the Lord's Supper. Compare Matt. xxvi, 26—29; Luke xxii, 17—20; 1 Cor. xi, 23—26.

VER. 22. *And while they were eating*:—Namely, at another period of the protracted festal supper, and no doubt after Judas had gone out. See John xiii, 21—30. Lightfoot, however, in his racy "*Battle with a wasp's nest*," contends that the traitor "received the sacrament." So many others.———*Jesus took bread*:—"To invite them," says Calvin, "to partake of a new supper." The bread, of course, would be such as was lying on the table,—*unleavened bread*. But it would be finical to insist, at the present day, on the necessity of using the same kind of bread. It is not now so much *the bread of affliction* that we need to eat, as *the bread of true nourishment, the bread of life. The best bread in itself is the best bread for us to use.*———*And blessed*:—He uttered a *benediction* (εὐλογήσας),—a *eulogy* (εὐλογία) as it were. The eulogy would rise up in the form of a *thanksgiving*. (See next verse, and also Luke xxii, 19, and 1 Cor. xi, 24.) He would give thanks for the bread, and for what it signified. So outstanding was the act of *thanksgiving* that the entire ordinance came, in course of time, to be frequently called *the Eucharist*, that is, *the Thanksgiving*. This name was common even in Justin Martyr's time, in the second century. (*Apol.* i, § 66.)———*And brake*:—The unleavened bread consisted of *cakes*, something like *water-biscuits;* and hence it was naturally subdivided, not by *cutting*, but by *breaking*. The *breaking* was symbolical of *the 'breaking' of his own body by the act of crucifixion.* See 1 Cor. xi, 24.———*And gave to them, and said, Take*: Namely, with the hand, and then eat. In some ecclesiastical communities the bread is put by the officiating minister into the mouth of the communicant, as if it were too holy to be handled by the laity. The reason for such a mode of acting is superstitious. But if the superstition be veiled, then the practice suggests an infantile condition of the communicant, although it is only the "carnal," and not the "spiritual," who continue to be "babes in Christ" (1 Cor. iii, 1).———*Eat*:—This word was not in the autograph of the evangelist, but must have been added, by some harmonist, out of Matt. xxvi, 26, and 1 Cor. xi, 24. It is wanting in all the chief old manuscripts, such as ℵABCDKLMPUΠ, and in all the chief old versions,—the Vulgate, the two Syriacs, the Coptic, Sahidic, Armenian, Æthiopic. It is omitted by all the modern editors. The word, however, is manifestly implied. In making a narrative, or in giving instructions, it is not needful to state everything expressly.———*This is my body*:—*This*, that is, *This 'thing' which I give you* (τοῦτο),—that is, *This bread.* When he says, *This 'is' my body*, it cannot be that he meant, *This is my real body in a transubstantiated condition.* He was 'at home' in his real body, at the moment he was speaking. His hand, a part of his real body, was handling the 'sacramental' bread, and was therefore distinct from it. His tongue, with which he was speaking, and his eyes through which he was looking, were certainly no parts of the bread which he handled and handed, but were at some considerable and mensurable distance from it. It cannot be, therefore, that the body, which gave the bread, was gathered up into the bread, so as to displace and annihilate

Take, eat: [n] this is my body. 23 And he took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave *it* to them: and they all drank of it. 24 And he said unto them,

[n] John 6. 51.

---

the substantive reality of the bread, while it continued, nevertheless, even while *given*, to be the organism *giving*. There was neither trans*form*ation, nor trans*substanti*ation. What was there then? Symbolization, or sacramental representation. Patrizi says indeed, as spokesman for the whole Roman Catholic church, "By the words, *This is my body*, Christ converted the bread into his body." *(Com. in Marcum, in loc.)* But Augustin, on the other hand, says,—"How is the bread his body? and the cup, or that which the cup contains, how is it his blood? *These are therefore called sacraments, because in them one thing is seen, while another thing is understood.*" *(Sermo,* cclxxii.) "*Signs,*" he says again, "when they pertain to divine things are called *sacraments.*" *(Epist.* cxxxviii, 1, 7.) Sacraments, then, are signs, not miracles of reciprocal annihilation and creation. "*Sacraments,*" he says in another place, "would not be *sacraments*, if they had not a certain similitude to the things of which they are sacraments. But from this similitude *they also very frequently receive the names of the things themselves.*" *(Epist.* xcviii, 9.) Hence the 'sacramental bread' receives the name of *the Lord's body*.

Ver. 23. *And he took the cup*:—It is simply *(a) cup* in ℵBCDLXΔ, 1. So in Matthew. The modern critical editors omit the article. It is not unlikely, nevertheless, that there was only one cup on the table. Compare Luke xxii, 20, and 1 Cor. xi, 25.———*And having given thanks*:—For the cup, as formerly for the bread. The feast itself was protracted into a second course, and hence the appropriate repetition of the thanks-offering.———*He gave (it) to them, and they all drank of it*:—Very literally, *out of it*. The evangelist hastens, anticipatively, along the historic line of action. But doubtless before the completion of the communicating act, and probably indeed before any one of the disciples partook of the cup, the words of institution, or rather the words of explanation, as contained in the next verse, would be spoken.

Ver. 24. *And he said to them, This*:—That is, *This thing*, or, as it is expressly supplemented for us in Luke xxii, 20 and 1 Cor. xi, 25, *This cup*. And yet the reference is obviously and admittedly to the wine in the cup. The freedom of the expression should be a lesson to those who insist on excluding every vestige of freedom from the phraseology of the 22d verse.———*Is my blood*:—Augustin used to explain the copulative element of the phraseology by referring to the expression in 1 Cor. x, 4, "that Rock *was* Christ." Or, we might refer to Matt. xiii, 38, "The field *is* the world: the good seed *are* the children of the kingdom; but the tares *are* the children of the wicked one." The red wine employed at the passover was an appropriate symbol of the Saviour's blood, and especially in this respect,—that when added mystically to the mystic bread, it made a mystic feast. There was reason indeed for mourning too. For, while the *bread* pointed forward to nourishment and strength that were to be, the *breaking* of it pointed backward to manglement and woe. The poured-out wine, too, not only pointed forward to festivity and joy, it also pointed backward to a sacrifice, by blood-shedding, of an inestimably precious life. So strangely near to each other, and interconnected, are sorrow and

° This is my blood of the new testament, which is ° Luke 22. 20. 1 Cor. 11. 25.

joy. In death there is the fount of life. In the anguish of the heart there is the well-spring of bliss and joy. It is the paradox of saving grace.———*Of the new testament*:–Or rather *covenant*. The word is thirteen times translated *testament* in the Authorized Version of the New Testament, and twenty times translated *covenant*. Its Hebrew equivalent properly means *covenant*. But its classical import is *latter will* or *testament*. Neither of the translations does full justice to the unique transaction referred to. Indeed no human word could. And to have used a divine word would simply have been to speak an unintelligibility. The reference is to that *Arrangement* or *Disposition of things*, in virtue of which mercy, and the possibility of true and everlasting bliss, are extended to the sinful human race. It was a glorious device, culminating in the atoning sacrifice of "the Lamb of God." It was a *Covenant*, inasmuch as there is, inherent in it, an element of reciprocity. God, on his part, does something. He does much. But the blessing involved in what he does is suspended, so far as men's enjoyment of it is concerned, on acquiescence on their part, or cordial acceptance, or faith. It is also of the nature of a *Testamentary Deed*. For there is involved in it a *Disposition* or *Disposal of the effects or goods* which constitute *the property of God:* in virtue of which Disposition it is that men, who acquiesce or believe, become his "heirs." The deed is a real Testament, for it is duly and solemnly attested and testified. And it is also really *a Last Will*, for it is a final expression of the Will and Wish of God. There was need too—in contemplation of certain sublime moral and political ends to be subserved—for an interposing death (Heb. ix, 16, 17), although there was no need for the final departure of God from the midst of his own property. His presence in the midst of it, and his enjoyment of his goods, do not interfere with the presence and enjoyments of his "heirs," but only crown their privileges and happiness. The divine Plan of mercy has thus in it both the essentials of a *covenant* and the essentials of a *Testament*. But still *covenant* is the more prominent idea. And as the covenanting parties must, in so peculiar a case, approach each other through the solemnity of a sacrifice, the Saviour says "This is my *blood* of the new Covenant." There is some reason for regarding the word *new* as imported from Luke xxii, 20 and 1 Cor. xi, 25. It is wanting in the uncial manuscripts ℵBCDL, and in the Coptic and Sahidic (Ming.) versions, and it is left out by Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford. Griesbach and Meyer approve. The reference indeed is undoubtedly to *the 'new' Covenant*, which was in truth just the one grand Scheme of mercy. The 'old' one, the Jewish, was but adumbrative,—the shadow, cast before, of the coming reality.———*Which is shed*:–Or, *which is being shed*. Our Saviour might have used a future expression, for the real blood-shedding was still future. He might also have used a past expression, for the actual blood-shedding was the logical antecedent of the commemorative ordinance. But he chooses to use a present expression, for to his mind the little space of time that was yet to elapse before his decease was as it were no time at all.———*For many*:–How many is not indicated. But they must be so many as to constitute a *multitude*. We know from other passages that the *multitude* consisted of *the whole of mankind*. See 1 Tim. ii, 6; 2 Cor. v, 14;

shed for many. 25 Verily I say unto you, I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine, until that day that I drink it [p]new in the kingdom of God. [p] 2 Pet. 3. 13.

26 And when they had sung an [4]hymn, they [4] Or, *psalm.*

---

Heb. ii, 9; 1 John ii, 2, "By the word *many*," says Calvin, "he means not "a part of the world only, but the whole human race, for he contrasts *many* "with *one*, as if he had said, that he would not be the Redeemer of one man "only, but would die to deliver *many* from the condemnation of the curse." The preposition *for* before *many*, (ὑπέρ), means properly *over*, that is, *in behalf of*. It is indeed just the Greek form of our English word *over*.

VER. 25. *Verily I say to you*:–I solemnly assure you.———*I shall drink no more*:–The negative is triple in the original, and thus very strong,—*I shall not drink,—no, no more.*———*Of the fruit of the vine*:–The word *fruit* means literally *progeny*, and is here applied to the wine, which is the elaborated product of the vine. Note, that according to our Saviour himself, the liquid contained in the cup was not literal blood, but *the fruit of the vine.*———*Until that day when I drink it new*—as drink it I assuredly shall–*in the kingdom of God*:–Namely, when, at the second coming of our Lord, the heavenly kingdom shall be established in all its intrinsic glory. The wine then used will be *new*, not in the sense of being *newly pressed from the grapes*, for "the old is better" (Luke v, 39), but in the sense of being one of the "all things," that are to be made "new." See 2 Pet. iii, 13, Rev. xxi, 5. The word rendered *new* (καινός) is quite a different word from that which is employed when *new wine* or *must*, as distinguished from that which is *old*, or ripe by means of age, is referred to, (νέος).

VERSES 26—31 take us through another of the scenes that were preliminary to the crisis. A corresponding paragraph is found in Matt. xxvi, 30—35. Compare Luke xxii, 39, and John xvi, 32.

VER. 26. *And when they had sung a hymn*:–Wycliffe has *the ympne*, that is, *the hymn*. So Luther, Principal Campbell, Alford. But it is neither *a hymn* nor *the hymn* in the original. The phrase is participial, *having hymned;* and, if the custom that prevailed in our Lord's time corresponded with the custom represented by the subsequent Rabbinical writers, and practised to the present day, more Psalms than one would be chanted at the conclusion of the feast. The "great Hallel"—a very simple oratorio of the *Hallel*ujah description—was chanted during the paschal feast. It consisted of Psalms cxiii, cxiv, cxv, cxvi, cxvii, cxviii,—which group of hymns "they cut in two parts," says Lightfoot; "a part of it they repeated in the very middle of the banquet, and "they reserved a part to the end."—"The hymn which Christ now sang with "his disciples after meat, was the latter part," which, according to the school of Shammai, extends over Psalms cxiv—cxviii, while according to the school of Hillel, it extended only over Psalms cxv—cxviii. (*Lightfoot's Works*, xi, *pp.* 435—6.) The British Jews, before partaking of the fourth and last cup, "the cup of blessing," repeat, says Mills, Psalms cxv, cxvi, cxvii, cxviii, and cxxxvi. (*British Jews*, p. 201.) Tyndale and Coverdale take all the poetry out of the evangelist's expression, by rendering it, *when they had sayd grace.*———*They went out into the Mount of Olives*:–'*Into*,' or 'to.' So Tyndale, Wakefield,

went out into the mount of Olives. 27 And Jesus saith unto them, All ye shall be offended because of me this night: for it is written, [q]I will smite the shepherd, and

[q] Zech. 13. 7.

---

Campbell, Edgar Taylor, Godwin. They *went out*, viz. from the place where they were in the city, and from the city. The scene, whence the exit took place, consisted of concentric spaces.—*The Mount of Olives*:–Where our Lord, as well as many of the other sojourners, was accustomed to spend his nights. See chap. xi, 11, 12, 19.

Ver. 27. *And Jesus saith to them, All ye*:–The *ye* is emphatic. But it must have been absent altogether from the evangelist's autograph. It is wanting in all the uncial manuscripts except the Cambridge (D), and has, no doubt, been imported from Matt. xxvi, 31. We must read then, *ye all*, not *all ye*.——— *Shall be offended because of me this night*:–The expression *because of me this night*, like the *ye*, has been imported from Matthew's narrative. It is wanting in ℵBC*DHLSVWᵇXΓΔ, and is left out by Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford. It was condemned as spurious by both Mill and Griesbach, as also by Fritzsche. Mark's narrative is briefer than Matthew's, but quite harmonious.—*Ye shall be offended*:–Literally, *ye shall be scandalized*. Such is the Rheims version. Edgar Taylor's is, *ye will all offend*. Worsley, *ye will all be made to offend*. Mace, *you will all be staggered*. Norton, very paraphrastically, *There is none of you whose faith will not be shaken*. Principal Campbell, with remarkable faithfulness to the idea, *I shall prove a stumbling-block to you all*. Wakefield and Rodolphus Dickinson, too freely, *ye will all forsake me*. The idea is, *You will all be unwittingly caught and insnared, (so that you will be staggered in your faith, and scandalized in your feelings)*. See chap. iv, 17; vi, 3; ix, 42, 43, 45, 47. They would, under the malign influence of insnaring circumstances, lose confidence in the Lord, as the long hoped-for Messiah.———*For*: An event, necessary for the weal of universal man, but not yet fully understood by the disciples,—was imminent. In its very approach it would shake their faith.———*It stands written*:–Viz. in Zech. xiii, 7, in the midst of a remarkable oracle, which still needs, for its satisfactory interpretation, a considerably increased amount of scrutiny.———*I will smite the Shepherd*: In the original Hebrew the same idea is more poetically put, *Sword! awake against my Shepherd, even against a man, my fellow (my neighbour), saith Jehovah of hosts; Smite the Shepherd!* It is thus the Divine Sword that is to awake and smite. "Many hands were raised to wound him, | None would interpose to save; | *But the awful stroke that found him*, | *Was the stroke that Justice gave.*" (Kelly.) The passage, says Henry Cowles, "remarkably recognizes the divine agency in the atoning death of the Lamb of God." (*The Minor Prophets*, p. 366.) "The great doctrine here set forth," says Dr. Moore, "is, that the death of Christ was a judicial act, in which he endured the penalty of the law, whose penal power was symbolized by this sword of divine wrath." (*Prophets of the Restoration*, p. 293.) Man acted coincidently, it is true, and most wilfully and wickedly, at some points in the scene. Indeed, his agency, in some respects,—as so often in other cases,—outran the divine order of things. But still the divine agency went on, in uninterrupted dignity, with the dread solemnities of its own high and holy work, and completed the sacrifice. (See Stroud's *Physical Cause of Christ's*

the sheep shall be scattered. 28 But after that I am risen, [r] I will go before you into Galilee. 29 [s] But Peter said unto him, Although all shall be offended, yet *will* not I. 30 And Jesus saith unto him, Verily I say unto thee, That this day, *even* in this night, before

[r] Chap. 16. 7.
[s] Mat. 26. 33. Luke 22. 33. John 13. 37.

---

*Death.*)———*And the sheep shall be scattered*:–The sudden withdrawal of the Shepherd's presence will loosen for a season the bond that bound the sheep together. They will be scattered in dismay.

VER. 28. *But after that I am risen*:–Namely, from the condition into which I shall be smitten by the awakened Sword. The disciples, however, would have no proper conception of what their Lord meant. Compare Chap. ix, 10. Their thoughts, though vibrating with solemnity and pathos, yet ran in lines that led far away from the reality that was actually imminent.———*I shall go before you into Galilee*:–Namely, like a shepherd, who goes before his sheep, that they may follow him. Though the sheep were, for the moment, to be scattered, yet they would continue, and especially the lambs of the flock, to be divinely cared for. "I will turn my hand," saith the Lord, "on the little ones" (Zech. xiii, 7) to rescue and protect them. This would be realized when the Shepherd reappeared on the scene.

VER. 29. *But Peter said to him, Although all shall be offended*:–Or *scandalized*, or *staggered and stumbled*. The expression rendered *although* is more emphatic than our translation would suggest. It is literally *even if* (και ει). Such is the reading, not of the Received Text only, but also of ADEFHKMNSUVWb ΧΓΔΠ. In ℵBCGL, 1, 69, however, the expression is reversed, *if even* (ει και). This last reading has been accepted by Tregelles, Tischendorf in his 8th edition, and Alford. The variation is of very trifling significance; but we feel disposed to adhere to the Received Reading as the less likely to be tinkeringly modified.———*Yet (will) not I*:–The *will*, even in English, can be very well dispensed with, as in Wycliffe and the Rheims. Literally the expression is, *but not I*. The whole remark of Peter was compressed. It might be unfolded thus,—"Others may be staggered and stumbled, *but not I*. Even if they all shall falter, I will not." 'Just like Peter,'—a child of manly impulse, but far too impetuous and self-reliant. "This was indeed," says Petter, "his principal and most dangerous error and fault at this time, that he presumed too much upon himself."

VER. 30. *And Jesus saith to him, Verily I say unto thee*:–As if he had said *Ah Peter, I assure you*.———*That this day, even in this night*:–Or, *To-day, this very night*. Note the limitation of the time. The day had begun. It began with the night. And already was the night far advanced. Not only, however, some time or other during the day, but before even the first or nocturnal half of it should be concluded, the event about to be predicted would take place. So short was to be the distance between Peter's presumption and his fall.——— *Before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny me thrice*:–The time is still further limited. Long before the dawn of the morning, the denial would take place. In the other evangelists, the word *twice* does not occur. It is said in Matthew (xxvi, 34), *Before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice*. The expressions in Luke xxii, 34 and John xiii, 38 correspond. But as the expression *before the*

the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny me thrice. 31 But he spake the more vehemently, If I should die with thee, I

---

*cock crow* seems to mean, *before the cock crow once*, there has been perplexity among some of the reverent students of the Word, while there has been no little cock-crowing,—not once only or twice,—on the part of those who will not admit that there is anything divine in the Gospel. Evanson, for example, says, "This relation is absolutely irreconcilable with what is given in the Gospel according to Matthew." (*Dissonance*, p. 265.) Scholten contends that the word *twice* must have been a gloss introduced into the text of the Proto-Mark. (*Het Oudste Evang.*, p. 229.) So Michelsen. (*Het Evang. van Markus*, p. 170.) But there is really no difficulty, if the subject be looked at, not microscopically, and crotchetously, but in a broad and genial spirit. "The difference," says Alexander, "is the same as that between saying, *before the bell rings*, and *before the second bell rings* (for church or dinner); the reference in both expressions being to the last and most important signal, to which the first is only preliminary." Or we may conceive the matter thus:—No doubt there would be more said in the conversation than is recorded,—much more. It is, as in most other cases, but snatches of the interview that are narrated. And, in the different narratives, different aspects of the one sum-total are presented to view. Mark—very likely instructed by Peter himself—presents one particular item of what was said, which was merged by the other evangelists in their more generic representations. Hence his '*twice*' and '*thrice*,'—the echoes no doubt of the actual utterances of our Lord. Our Lord may have said, at one part of the interview, *Ah Peter, thou dost not know thyself; this very night thou shalt deny me thrice.* Intervening remarks may then have occurred, and our Saviour may have said again, *Yea, this very night, even before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me.* At another stage of the conversation, our Lord would say, *Before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny me thrice.* The respective records of the fulfilment of the Lord's prediction admit of easy explication and adjustment, when looked at in the light of this variety of detail. And although these records may not be constructed with lawyer-like scrupulosity of phrase, and iterative particularity, yet they are really admirable reflexes of the actual occurrences, and admirably adapted, when accepted in the spirit in which they were given, to secure all the grand purposes intended.—*Deny*:—The verb is compound and very strong (ἀπαρνήσῃ),—*thou shalt utterly deny (and renounce)*.

VER. 31. *But he*:—That is, *Peter*. The name, indeed, is added in many of the manuscripts, including ACGMNSU, and also in the Armenian, Æthiopic, and Philoxenian-Syriac versions;—intrudingly however.———*Spake*: A happy version,—by accident or instinct, on the part of Tyndale,—of the right reading (ἐλάλει), but not of the reading that was before him (ἔλεγε). He may have been influenced by the Vulgate (*loquebatur*). The verb is in the imperfect,—*he persisted in speaking*. There was repetitiousness,—though the evangelist did not deem it needful to preserve the minute details.———*The more vehemently*:—There is rather a reference, however, to superfluity of repetition, than to vehemence of intonation or utterance, *more and more and still more* (ἐκπερισσῶς—μᾶλλον). Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, omit the

will not deny thee in any wise. Likewise also said they all.
32 [t] And they came to a place which was named Gethsemane: and he saith to his disciples, Sit ye here, while I shall pray. 33 And he taketh with him Peter and James and John, and began to be sore amazed,

[t] Mat. 26. 36. Luke 22. 39. John 18. 1.

---

superadded word (μᾶλλον), on the authority of ℵBCDL, and some of the ancient versions—the Vulgate, the Syriac-Peshito, Sahidic, and Coptic, and many codices of the Old-Latin. It is quite possible that it was, originally, a marginal explanation of the other word, which occurs nowhere else. If so, we must reduce the translation into *more and more.*———*If it should be necessary for me to die with thee, I shall not utterly deny thee*:–A compressed way of saying, —*If it should be necessary for one to die with thee, to avoid utterly denying thee, I shall die, but I shall not utterly deny thee.* No doubt Peter was honest in his repeated asseverations. His whole soul would be revolting from the idea of renouncing and denying his Lord. But, like so many others, he did not know, till he was put to the test, how weak he was.———*And in like manner said all also*:–That is, *And all the rest also expressed themselves in like manner.* Of nothing were they more convinced, than that they would stand true to their Lord, happen what might either to him or to them.

Verses 32—42. The Lord's agony and the disciples' sleep. Compare the corresponding paragraphs in Matt. xxvi, 36—46, and Luke xxii, 40—46.

Ver. 32. *And they came*:–Literally, *come.* We are taken back, and look on. ———*To a place whose name (was) Gethsemane*:–The word means *oil-press.* And, no doubt, originally there would be, in the spot, an olive-oil press. The real locality cannot now be precisely determined. Neither is it necessary. There is an enclosed spot, lying at the base of the western slope of the Mount of Olives, which is called Gethsemane *(El-Jesmâniye).* It is kept by the Latin Christians, and contains eight extremely aged olive trees. "If," says Dr. Wilson, "the Gethsemane of the Bible be not here,—and we can see no reason "for disturbing the tradition regarding it,—it cannot certainly be far distant, "as must be apparent from the incidental notices of the evangelists." *(Lands of the Bible*, vol. i, p. 481.)———*And he saith to his disciples, Sit here, until I shall pray*:–Until my prayer shall be past, (ἕως προσεύξωμαι). The great crisis was at hand; and it was casting its dark shadow before on the spirit of our Lord. He felt that he must get into comparative retirement, in order that he might, without distraction, grapple with the appalling difficulties of the trial, and open up his heart, in the time of extremity, to his Father.

Ver. 33. *And he taketh with him Peter and James and John*:–The elite of his elect,—who had been witnesses of the counterpart scene, the Transfiguration (chap. ix, 2). They were admitted by their own brethren to be a representative triumvirate, and *primi inter pares.* For, even among those, who are good and true, some are better fitted than others for posts of eminence, and for intimacy of intercourse.———*And began to be sore amazed*:–*Stunned*, as it were. That is the radical idea of the word. (See *G. Curtius, Grundzüge*, p. 206). He was *astonied.* (Compare the other passages, where the word occurs, chap. ix, 15, xvi, 5, 6. See also Acts iii, 11.) Probably never before, within the limitations of his finite experience, had the sphere of our Lord's vision, in reference

and to be very heavy; 34 and saith unto them, "My [u] John 12. 27.
soul is exceeding sorrowful unto death: tarry ye here, and
watch. 35 And he went forward a little, and fell on the
ground, and [v] prayed that, if it were possible, the [v] Heb. 5. 7.

---

to sins, and their desert and effects, been so vast. Probably never before had the corresponding sphere of his emotions, in relation to these sins, been so profoundly agitated and heaved. This state of things now 'began.' And, as it 'began,' it caused an *amazement*, that culminated in consternation and dismay. Wycliffe translates the verb, *to drede* (to dread); Tyndale, *to waxe abasshed;* Coverdale, *to waxe fearefull;* the Geneva, *to be afraid.*———*And to be very heavy* (ἀδημονεῖν):-The etymology of the word is uncertain. But its meaning, generally considered, is certain,—*to be greatly distressed.* Compare Phil. ii, 26. Tyndale's version is borrowed from Luke, *to be in an agony.*

VER. 34. *And he saith to them*: Namely after the terrible experience had "begun" to roll in on his spirit.———*My soul is exceeding sorrowful*:-The idea is, *My soul is sorrowful all round and round* (περίλυπος). It was a kind of moral midnight within the periphery of his soul. At no point in the circumference was there a single gleam of light.———*Unto death*:-Not a mere rhetorical addition. The weight of woe was literally crushing out the Saviour's life. In bearing it, he was making more literal sacrifice of himself, than ever had been made on literal altar. The sacrifice would have been complete, then and there, had it not been, that it appeared to him and to his Father, that certain momentous purposes of publicity, in reference to the conclusion of the tragedy, would be better subserved by shifting the scene.——— *Remain here and watch*: He had wished his chosen three to be near him in his woe, and yet, as it advanced, he felt that he must retire even from them, and be alone with himself and his Father. "Of the people" none could be "with him" in the agony,—none on the altar. Still he wished that his chosen ones should not be at a great distance, and hence he said, *Remain here.* He desired also to be the object of their active sympathy, and hence he said, *and watch.*

VER. 35. *And he went forward a little*:-Still farther from the spot where the eight disciples had been asked to halt, (verse 32).———*And fell on the ground*:-Gradually. The verb is in the imperfect. He would kneel first of all, (Luke xxii, 41).———*And prayed*:-He continued in prayer. The verb is in the imperfect. He *kept addressing* his Heavenly Father. His aim in thus addressing his Father is brought out in the next clause.———*That*:-*In order that* (ἵνα). ———*If it were possible*:-Very literally, *if it is possible.* We are taken back to the very time when the Saviour's prayers were uttered, and to the spot whence they were uttered, and we hear the very words which he used.—*Possible*:-The reference is not so much *to absolute*, as to *relative possibility*,—possibility in consistency with the great objects contemplated in the mission of the Saviour. ———*The hour might pass from him*:-*The hour* that was imminent, and that embraced within its compass his betrayal, his arrestment, and the desertion of his disciples. He did not pray that the hour of the atoning sacrifice might pass by. We cannot conceive of that. It was the incidental woes, inflicted so superfluously and wantonly by men, and to no small extent by his own chosen

hour might pass from him. 36 And he said, [w] Abba, Father, all things *are* possible unto thee; take away this cup from me: [x] nevertheless not what I will,

[w] Rom. 8. 15. Gal. 4. 6.

[x] Ps. 40. 8. John 4. 34. John 6. 38.

disciples,—it was these apparently,—these more particularly at least,—to which the cry of his spirit referred.

VER. 36. *And he said, Abba Father*:—The filial element in his spirit rose up and overshadowed all the other elements of relationship. Mark alone records the 'bilingual' appellation, Aramaic and Greek. No doubt it would be genuine; and most likely it would be current in certain 'bilingual' home-circles, more especially at moments of earnest address on the part of children. At such moments there is often a tendency to emphatic redundancy or repetitiousness of expression. Compare Romans viii, 15, and Gal. iv, 6. As employed by our Lord, the dual form of the appellation is delightfully fitted to suggest that, in his great work, he personated in his single self not Jews only, but Gentiles also.——*All things are possible to thee*:—Literally true. *A thing* is *a think:* and all things thinkable are possible to almightiness. To imagine that there are actual limits to God's power, is merely to bewilder oneself in *unthinkabilities*. In the preceding verse the reference is to conditional possibility. Hence the '*if*.' In this the reference is to absolute possibility. Hence the '*all*.'——*Take away this cup from me*:—Or, as the same word is rendered in Luke xxii, 42, *remove*. Literally, *carry beyond, bear past*. The Rheims translation is, *transferre this chalice from me*. Not that our Saviour rued his enterprise, or desired to 'back out of it.' Infinitely far from that. The cup, which he felt it so dreadful to drink, had in it ingredients which were never mingled by the hand of his Father, such as the treachery of Judas, the desertion of his disciples, denial on the part of Peter, the trial in the Sanhedrim, the trial before Pilate, the scourging, the mockery of the soldiery, the crucifixion, &c., &c. All these incidental and unessential ingredients were put into the cup by men wilfully and wantonly. Hence the petition, *Take away from me this cup*,—this cup as it is. Without these superadded ingredients the potion would have been unquestionably bitter enough; and it need not be doubted that, in consideration of that bitterness, the exquisite sensibility of our Lord would be conscious of a feeling of shrinking and instinctive recoil. But still he had come for the very purpose of "tasting death for every man," and was no doubt willing and wishful to die.——*But not what I will, but what thou wilt*:—*But the question is not, What will I? but What (wilt) thou?* The reference in the word *will*, in so far as it is applied by the Saviour to himself, is to that which Petter calls the *sensitive will*, and the schoolmen, *voluntas sensualitatis*. The more literal translation, however, of the verb is *wish*, rather than *will*. The question with the Saviour was not, *What do I wish?* but *What does my Father wish?* There was infinite submissiveness to the wish and will of his Father. If the Father deemed it best that the cup, just as it was, should be drained, the Son was absolutely acquiescent. It is easy to conceive of the greatest possible diversity in the circumstantial incidents of the atoning sacrifice. The Saviour would have wished them to have been different from what they were. Who would not? But on almost every-

but what thou wilt. 37 And he cometh, and findeth them sleeping, and saith unto Peter, Simon, sleepest thou? couldest not thou watch one hour? 38 Watch ye and pray, lest ye enter into temptation. [y] The spirit truly *is* ready, [y] Rom. 7. 23. Gal. 5. 17. but the flesh *is* weak. 39 And again he went away, and prayed, and spake the same words. 40 And when he returned, he found them asleep again, (for their eyes were

---

thing that is done in this world, or that has to be endured, the foul fingers of sin are laid.

VER. 37. *And he cometh*: To his disciples, viz. at some intermission in the agony of his spirit, when he had got strength through prayer. See Luke xxii, 43.———*And findeth them sleeping*: So far were they from profoundly realizing the solemnities that were imminent.———*And saith to Peter*:–Peter is no doubt singled out, partly because he was the leader of the three, and partly because he had singled himself out but a little before. See verses 29, 31.———*Simon, sleepest thou?* Although thou sawest that I was in such distress, and although I expressly desired thee to keep awake and watch?———*Couldst thou not watch one hour?* Hadst thou not strength for that? Surely thou wilt not say so. Why then not use thy strength to watch, when I desired it, that I might have the consolation of thy sympathy? Note the expression *one hour*. It seems to indicate that our Saviour had suffered an entire hour of agony. How long that period!—when we remember that every moment would be stretched to its utmost.

VER. 38. *Watch ye*:–The three disciples, we may suppose, had waked up, when Peter was addressed. What our Lord said to one, he meant for all; and here he expressly addresses all.———*And pray, in order that ye may not enter into temptation*:–They were in danger of losing confidence in him as the Messiah. There was therefore much need for faithful watching and earnest praying. ———*The spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak*:–The Saviour's gracious apology for the languor of his disciples. Even while he spoke to them, they had but imperfectly waked up. He saw them struggling with the oppressive languor,—but ineffectually. And yet, true, as well as gracious, though his apology was, *the spirit was nevertheless to be somewhat blamed.* If it had been sympathetic to the quick, it would have roused the *flesh*. Some have supposed that the words, *the spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak*, are the Saviour's explanation of his own distress. Unnatural. The supposition proceeds on the false assumption that the Saviour's horror *was a weakness*, and that it would have been more magnanimous and glorious to have had no experience of shrinking from the ingredients of the dreadful cup.

VER. 39. *And again he went away*:–His agony returned on him. Perhaps the very lethargy of his disciples might call up before his view the whole appalling succession of incidental and unessential woes that were about to overtake him. ———*And prayed, and spake the same words*:–More literally, as the Rheims has it, *saying the selfsame word.* The term *word* is used collectively, as when we speak of *the word of God.*

VER. 40. *And when he returned, he found them asleep again, for their eyes were heavy*:–Were, so to speak, '*weighted*' (βεβαρημένοι), or, according to the

heavy,) neither wist they what to answer him. 41 And he cometh the third time, and saith unto them, Sleep on now,

---

better reading (καταβαρυνομένοι), *weighed down*. The *for* introduces, not a reason, but an illustration, of their sleepiness. It would appear that they had not deliberately surrendered themselves to sleep. They did not lie down, for instance. They sat, and, to a certain extent, sought to keep themselves awake. But ever and anon, and prevailingly, their eyelids closed.———*And they wist not what to answer him*: They knew not what they could say to him in reply. They had no excuse which they could honestly plead.—*Wist*, or *wissed* as it were, that is *knew*, is now obsolete, but is connected with an interesting group of words, *wise*, *wisdom*, *wizard*, and the German *wissen* "to know." On another line it is connected with the Anglo-Saxon *witan*, the Dutch *weten*, and the Gothic *vitan*, "to know," around which we have another group of words, *wit*, *wits*, *witty*, *witless*, *witch*, *outwit*, *to-wit*.

VER. 41. *And he cometh the third time*:–After a third retirement for a solitary endurance of his overwhelming agony.———*And saith to them, Sleep on now*:–A rather unhappy translation, almost suggesting irritation and irony on the part of our Lord. Petter actually thinks that our Lord spoke "in a taunting manner." But the verb rendered *sleep on*—a translation got from Coverdale—is simply *sleep*, the translation of Tyndale, the Geneva, and the Rheims; and the expression rendered *now* means literally *the remainder* (τὸ λοιπόν), that is, *the remainder of the time that is available*. Tyndale and the Geneva render it *henceforth*. *Sleep the remaining interval!* It was in compassion that our Lord thus spoke. His own struggle was meanwhile past. He did not feel the same need of the intense active sympathy of his disciples, which, in the crisis of his agony, he had so fervently desired. He saw, too, that they were still overpowered with drowsiness, notwithstanding the persevering efforts they were making to wake up. He hence spoke to them soothingly; and, as Cardinal Cajetan expresses it, "indulgently," that they might get the refreshment they so much required,—*Sleep for the interval that remains. I can now calmly wait and watch alone.*———*And take your rest*:–Or, as the Rheims has it, *and take rest. Rest yourselves*, that is, *refresh yourselves*. The word is so rendered in 1 Cor. xvi, 18; 2 Cor. vii, 13; Philem. 7, 20.———*It is enough* (ἀπέχει):–An expression that has given almost infinite trouble to critics. It fairly puzzled the Syriac translator. He renders it, *the end is at hand*. Our English translation is just a reproduction of the Vulgate version *(sufficit)*, which must, one should suppose, have been dashed off in a fit of despair. But howsoever dashed off, or otherwise introduced, there it stands; and Luther, in his version, simply accepted it, without any attempt at an independent judgement,—as did Erasmus also, and Tyndale, and Coverdale. Henry Stephens, the lexicographer, was much perplexed with the word, and in particular with its Vulgate translation; but at length he found a solitary passage, in one of the apocryphal *Odes of Anacreon* (xxviii, 33), in which the term would seem to bear no other interpretation. It afforded him great relief. Beza too found in the same Ode a corresponding relief, and speaks indeed of the passage "occurring to him," in the midst of his doubts, as if it had been he, and not Henry Stephens, who had first alighted on it. He makes no reference at all to Stephens. The transla-

and take *your* rest: it is enough, the [z] hour is come; [a] John 7. 30. John 8. 20. John 13. 1.

tion of the Vulgate, thus fortified out of Anacreon, was thenceforward regarded as confirmed. It was accepted by Castellio, the Geneva, Piscator, Erasmus Schmid, Sebastian Schmidt. It is found in all the Dutch versions, the earlier, the later, the latest. So too in Diodati, Zinzendorf, Rilliet; and in many other versions. Accepting the translation,—and Wetstein hunted up another passage from Cyril (on Hagg. ii, 9),—the great body of expositors have interpreted the expression as a repetition "in earnest" of the ironical expression that precedes, as if our Lord were now saying plainly, *ye have had enough of sleep.* See Diodati, Petter, and Schleusner. But Wolf supposes that the Saviour refers to his own sufferings, *I have suffered enough for the present, and it only remains that I endure the sufferings that are to come!* Neither phase of thought seems satisfactory. Grotius felt this, and imagined that the phrase must have an idiomatic import, corresponding to the technical expression employed in the Roman amphitheatre, when a gladiator was wounded, '*Habet,*' *He has it,—he has got it,—he has got the fatal wound.* The Saviour, according to Grotius, as it were says, *It is all over with me now. The time is past for any benefit to me from your sympathy.* An unlikely interpretation, both on philological and on moral grounds, but accepted nevertheless by Principal Campbell, who renders the phrase, *All is over.* Bengel's translation corresponds to a degree (*es ist aus*), only he gives it a turn in the direction of the disciples, not of the Saviour,—*It is over,* viz. *with your rest.* So Felbinger. Kypke's interpretation is, *The time is up.* Heumann again, and Wahl, and Godwin, would render the phrase, *It is past,* or *It is away,* that is, *My agony is past.* Le Clerc, *The thing is past,—my resolution to go on is taken.* There are other modifications of idea suggested by other expositors. But the great objection to all such interpretations is, that the verb does not mean, *to be away, to be past,* or *to be up,* or *to be over,* or *to be all over.* It means, when used intransitively, *to be distant.* Such is its meaning in all the other passages of the New Testament in which it occurs, with its intransitive signification. So Matt. xv, 8 and Mark vii, 6,—"their heart *is far* from me,"—"*is distant* from me." So Luke vii, 6, "when he *was* now not far from the house," that is, when he *was* now not far *distant* from the house." So Luke xv, 20, "when he *was* yet a great way *off*," that is, "when he *was* yet a long way *distant.*" And Luke xxiv, 13, "A village called Emmaus, which *was* from Jerusalem about threescore furlongs," that is, "which *was distant* from Jerusalem." We see no reason for departing, in the passage before us, from this, the word's accredited and ordinary signification. But the question arises, to what, or to whom, does the Saviour refer, when he says, "— is distant"? He refers, as we apprehend, not to a thing, but to a person, of whom he was thinking much, as is evident at once from the last clause of this verse, and from the next verse. But though thinking much of him, he did not feel inclined expressly to name him. The reference we take to be to Judas,—*He is distant,—He is at a distance.* The expression is thus not the unmasking of a previous sarcasm. It is the gracious utterance, partly to his own mind, and partly to the minds of his lethargic disciples, of a reason for indulging them in a few minutes more of rest. We shall lose much of the

behold, the Son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners.
42 Rise up, let us go; lo, he that betrayeth me is at hand.
43 [a] And immediately, while he yet spake, cometh [a] Mat. 26. 47. Luke 22. 47. John 18. 3.

---

true significance of the whole scene, and of the grandeur of the Saviour's demeanour, if we imagine that there was anything like hot haste and semi-irritation on the part of our Lord. There is not the slightest need for supposing that all the words, recorded by the evangelist, were spoken in rapid succession. It was, we believe, far otherwise. After our Saviour had got relief from the overwhelming pressure of his agony, and had graciously approached his disciples, and sympathized with them in their feelings of oppression, he would most probably seat himself beside them, and say soothingly, *Sleep for the remainder of the little time that we still have, and refresh yourselves.* Then he would add, as a reason for this indulgence, the word before us,—a word which did not demand, on the part of the disciples, any mental determination regarding the subject of the proposition. It was enough that they knew, that, whether a person or a thing were referred to, *distance* was affirmed. They might indeed have waked up, and inquired, "*—is distant?*" *who is? or what is?* But this was not necessary, if they understood that the reason for making a final effort to shake off their drowsiness was yet *at a distance.* After the Lord had said *(He) is at a distance,* we may suppose that he paused, and, turning his eyes in the direction of Jerusalem, wrapped himself up in his own meditations. At length, when the moving lights of the band around Judas became visible, the Lord broke silence, and spoke as follows.———*The hour has come*:–*The hour*, the crisis-time, the beginning of the end.———*Lo, the Son of man is delivered up*:–*Is in the act of being delivered up*, viz. by Judas. The verb is in the present tense. The event was now so imminent, that the Saviour speaks of it as transpiring.———*Into the hands of sinners*:–Literally *of the sinners.* The word is used, as often elsewhere, in its emphatic acceptation, and hence Godwin's translation does justice to its spirit, *of the wicked.* Such was the character of the white-washed men who bore sway in the Sanhedrim, and of the others who would co-operate with them in their eagerness to get rid of all who might disturb them in their hypocritical repose.

Ver. 42. *Rise up*:–*Rouse yourselves up.* There was no longer time for repose. ———*Let us go*:–*Let us voluntarily lead ourselves on* (ἄγωμεν), viz. that we may confront the traitor and his band. How sublimely does the heroism of our Lord reveal itself!———*Lo, he who delivereth me up is at hand*:–Instead of naming Judas, the Lord described him, and, in the description, verified his own former predictions regarding himself.

Verses 43—50. The delivering up of our Lord by the traitor Judas. For corresponding paragraphs, see Matt. xxvi, 47—56, Luke xxii, 47—53, and John xviii, 1—12.

Ver. 43. *And immediately, while he yet spake*:–Or, more literally, *while he is yet speaking*, viz. to the effect of what is recorded in the two preceding verses. ———*Cometh Judas*:–The Alexandrine and Cambridge Manuscripts (AD), as well as a few more uncials, add *Iscariot.* So do the Italic and Vulgate versions, as likewise both the Syriac-Peshito and the Syriac-Philoxenian. The great

Judas, one of the twelve, and with him a great multitude with swords and staves, from the chief priests and the scribes and the elders. 44 And he that betrayed him had given them a token, saying, Whomsoever I shall [b] kiss, that same is he; take him, and lead *him* away safely. 45 And as soon as he was come, he goeth straightway to him, and saith, [c] Master, master; and kissed him. 46 And they laid their hands on him, and took him.

[b] 2 Sa. 20. 9. Ps. 55. 21. Pro. 27. 6.

[c] Luke 6. 46.

---

majority of the uncial manuscripts, however, omit the addition, as do the Sahidic, Coptic, and Gothic versions; and it is more likely that, in this case, the transcribers would add, than it is that they would subtract.———*One of the twelve*:–It was such an astonishing thing that "one of the twelve" should be the chief agent in the arrestment of our Lord, that the phrase got linked, in the people's speech, to his name. Compare verse 10.———*And with him a great crowd*:–The word *great* has been probably added from Matt. xxvi, 47. It is wanting in both the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts, and in the Sahidic, Coptic, Gothic, Philoxenian-Syriac, and Armenian versions, as well as in several of the Old-Latin codices.———*With swords, and staves*:–Or *sticks, cudgels, 'shillelahs.'* The *crowd* was to a large extent a *mob.*———*From the chief priests, and the scribes, and the elders*:–The highest authorities in the state were represented by the crowd. There had been a council held, and authority communicated.

VER. 44. *But he that betrayed him*:–It is a participial expression, which we cannot well reproduce. It means *the deliverer up,—he who was being engaged in delivering him up.*———*Had given them a token*:–The word for *token* is compound (σύσσημον), and literally means *a token between parties,*—a mutually agreed-on token, sign, or signal,—"a concerted signal" *(Bloomfield).*———*Saying, Whomsoever I shall kiss, he it is*:–To what a depth of callousness the infatuated man had sunk!———*Take him*: *Seize him, arrest him.*———*And lead him away safely*:–Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, have *warily*; and Wycliffe has an alternative word *queyntely* (or *quaintly*), that is, *knowingly, skilfully.* The word means *securely, (so that there may be no chance of his escape).* Mace's translation of the whole clause is, *seize him, and don't let him escape.* It was, on the part of Judas, a detestable superfluity of instruction.

VER. 45. *And having come, he immediately came up to him*:–Without hesitation or falter. The tide of feeling was still strong, though the moment of ebbing was at hand.———*And saith, Master, Master*:–Or, as it is in the original, *Rabbi, Rabbi.* But in the ℵBC*DLMΔ, and in a large proportion of the Old-Latin Codices, as well as in the Coptic and Æthiopic versions, the word is single. *Rabbi* was evidently the designation by which our Lord was usually and familiarly addressed by his disciples. See chap. ix, 5; xi, 21.———*And kissed him*:–Viz. in an emphatic manner (κατεφίλησεν). The word is stronger than the uncompounded term used in the preceding verse.

VER. 46. *And they laid their hands on him*:–Or, more literally, *they clapped their hands on him* (ἐπέβαλαν).———*And took him*:–That is, *and held him fast.* Wycliffe has, *and heelden him.*

47 And [d] one of them that stood by drew a sword, and smote a servant of the high priest, and cut off his ear.

[d] John 18. 10.

48 And Jesus answered and said unto them, Are ye come out, as against a thief, with swords and *with* staves to take me? 49 I was daily with you in the temple teaching, and

---

VER. 47. *But one of them that stood by*:–Literally, *But one certain (individual) of those who stood by.* His name is withheld by all the evangelists but John (xviii, 10). No doubt wisely. Feelings of revenge might have been awakened. Blood-thirst was strong in the east. But by the time that John wrote, the actors and sufferers had alike passed from the scene.———*Drew a sword*:–Or *his sword.* More literally, *having drawn 'the' sword.* What sword? It is as if the reader were expected to know that he had a sword. And indeed the circle of the disciples knew it well, and, no doubt, in their familiar narrations of the occurrence, they would naturally use the definite article. There were two swords among them (Luke xxii, 38). The Saviour allowed it,—for a parabolic purpose (Luke xxii, 36—38). It was needful for his disciples to bear in mind, that in the warfare which awaited them, they would have enough to do to guard their lives. And when all was done that could be done by them, their lives,—so far as earth was concerned,—would by no means be secure. Peter was one of the two disciples who had provided themselves with swords. It was customary of old in Syria,—as it is still,—for peaceful inhabitants to wear weapons of defence. As there is no proper system of police, every man has to be his own policeman.———*And smote a servant of the high priest*:–*Smote* or *struck.* The word used by the evangelist (παίω) is still preserved in domestic Scotch.—*A servant*:–It is *the servant* in the original. The High Priest seems to have sent one particular confidential servant, who might exercise a careful surveillance over Judas and the rest of the company.———*And cut off his ear*:–The stroke, aimed at the head, had been parried, but took partial effect.

VERSES 48—50. The fact recorded in the preceding verse stands apart by itself. So does the fact recorded in verses 48, 49. So does the fact recorded in verse 50. The evangelist adds, artlessly and aggregatively, detail to detail.

VER. 48. *And Jesus answered and said to them*:–His words were *responsive* to their acts, for their acts were as significant as words.———*Are ye come out as against a thief*:–Or, more literally, *As against a robber are ye come out?* More literally still, *As against a robber came ye out?* viz. from the city.———*With swords and cudgels to apprehend me*:–Swords and cudgels would not have been required against a mere thief. But robbers or brigands were men of arms, who were prepared to defend themselves to the last, and, in the ultimate extremity, to sell their lives at as dear a cost as possible. The word is always mistranslated *thief* in the three synoptic Gospels; but it is correctly translated *robber* in John's Gospel (x, 1, 8; xviii, 40), and in 2 Cor. xi, 26. Luther did the word more justice than our English translators, but yet not full justice. He rendered it *murderer.* Bengel in his German version put it right, *Räuber*, i.e. *Robber.*

VER. 49. *I was daily with you in the temple teaching*:–Or, as Rotheram gives

ye took me not: [e] but the scriptures must be ful- [e] Luke 24. 44.
filled.

50 And they all forsook him, and fled.

51 And there followed him a certain young man, having

---

it in the original collocation, *day by day was I with you in the temple, teaching.* ———*And ye took me not*:–*And ye did not arrest me.* Our Lord knew that he was not addressing the high Authorities,—though there were representatives of their number who had come out in the crowd (Luke xxii, 52). But he desired to make asseveration of his innocence, and to declare that such nocturnal stratagems were inconsistent with the dignity of justice.———*But the Scriptures must be fulfilled*:–The language is abruptly broken off in the original, *But that the Scriptures might be fulfilled*—. We must mentally add, *thus takes place.* It was divinely permitted to take place, because the Same Mind which foresaw what it was that Judas and the High Priest, and their co-conspirators, would voluntarily do, resolved to permit it, inasmuch as their act, however wicked and infatuated, would not frustrate the final end contemplated in the mission of our Lord,—his sacrificial death as "the Lamb of God bearing the sin of the world."

VER. 50. *And forsaking him, they all fled*:–The disciples, namely. The evangelist's own mind had turned from our Lord's enemies to his friends. But, not being practised in 'the wisdom of words,' he omits to mark the transition of reference.—The disciples *forsook* or *left* their Lord, being, as their Master had predicted, stumbled or staggered in their faith. See verse 27. They had never taken up the idea that it would be consistent with the ends contemplated in the mission of the Messiah, that he should be ignominiously arrested.

VERSES 51, 52, contain another connected incident, standing by itself in the evangelist's narrative.

VER. 51. *And a certain young man*:–Very literally, *and one certain young man.* But the present indefinite article 'a' or 'an' is just the original numeral *ane* or *one.* There have been many speculations and conjectures regarding this young man. Who was he? It is impossible to say with absolute certainty. Epiphanius (*Adversus Hæres.* lxxviii, 13), assumes that it was James the Just, the brother of our Lord—who was reported, in early times, to have confined himself ascetically to a single "cloth" or garment. A whimsical reason for an unlikely conjecture. Others,—inclusive in modern times of Ingraham (*Prince of the house of David, Letter* 29),—have supposed that it was the apostle John;—also a most unlikely conjecture, resting on no basis of probability whatever. Theophylact supposes it probable that the person referred to was a youth belonging to the house where our Lord ate the passover. Also a baseless conjecture. Cardinal Cajetan thinks that he may have been the son of the Gethsemane gardener. Grotius and Petter content themselves with the more generic conjecture that he would probably be a youth who lived in some contiguous villa. If any conjecture at all be allowed, we should be disposed, along with Bisping and Klostermann, to give the preference to the opinion of those who imagine that the evangelist refers, veilingly, to himself. The incident is, in itself, so exceedingly trifling, as compared with other incidents omitted from the narrative, that it seems difficult to account

a linen cloth cast about *his* naked *body;* and the young men laid hold on him: 52 And he left the linen cloth, and fled from them naked.

53 [f]And they led Jesus away to the high priest: and with him were assembled all the chief priests

[f] Mat. 26. 57. Luke 22. 54. John 18. 13.

---

for its introduction unless on the principle that the narrator had a deep personal interest in its occurrence, and delighted, though in an unobtrusive and modest manner, to link himself on, in what may have been to him the turning-point of his spiritual history, to the great event that was transpiring. We would agree, with Bisping, that it is most likely that the incident occurred, not in Gethsemane, or on the way to Jerusalem, but in the streets of the city. The evangelist has been setting down, one by one, a number of events only loosely connected'; and this is one of them.———*Followed him*:–The verb is in the imperfect tense,—*was following him.* In the manuscripts ℵBCL, however, it is compound (συνηκολούθει), *was following with the rest who were there.* Note that it was not the crowd which he followed. *It was Jesus.* His interest was in Jesus. Possibly as the crowd were passing along the streets, they would be excited, perhaps uproarious. The young man had been in bed; but, hearing the noise, he had started up, and rushed out undressed. He found it was Jesus, the Great Teacher, to whom, we may suppose, he had been listening with rapture in the temple,—it was Jesus who was being led off under arrest. He followed on for a little, and then perhaps began impulsively to interfere with the conductors, or to remonstrate. It is noteworthy that Mark and his mother lived in Jerusalem (Acts xii, 12).———*Having a linen cloth cast about (his) naked (body)*:–He had, on starting up, wrapped himself hurriedly in a loose robe or coverlet of fine linen, under which most probably he had been lying. The word is translated *fine linen* in Mark xv, 46. It is the term that is employed to denote that peculiar texture,—brought originally, not from Sidon, as Chifflet supposes (*De Linteis*, p. 23), but from Sind or India,—which was used for inwrapping the bodies of the dead. See Matt. xxvii, 59; Mark xv, 46; Luke xxiii, 53.———*And the young men laid hold on him*:–Or, more literally, *lay hold on him,* or *seize him.* He was regarded as in sympathy with their prisoner. He was therefore obnoxious to the virulent partizans in the crowd. Instead of, *and the young men lay hold on him,* the reading in the manuscripts ℵBC*DLΔ, and in the Vulgate, Syriac-Peshito, and Coptic versions, is simply, *and they lay hold on him.* Griesbach suspected the genuineness of the 'Received Reading.' Mill had previously condemned it. (*Prol.* § 409.) And it is omitted from the text by Lachmann, Fritzsche, Tischendorf, Tregelles. No doubt correctly.

Ver. 52. *But he left*:–In their hands.———*The linen cloth, and fled from them naked*:–It would be a memorable event to the young man himself.

Ver. 53. See, for parallels, Matt. xxvi, 57; Luke xxii, 54; John xviii, 13, 14.———*And they led off Jesus to the High Priest*:–Viz. Caiaphas. Indeed the name is added in several of the ancient manuscripts and versions,—intrusively, however. The detour to the house of Annas is merged out of view. See John xviii, 13.———*And with him were assembled all the chief priests and the elders and the scribes*:–All the prominent members of the Sanhedrim. The expres-

and the elders and the scribes. 54 And Peter followed him afar off, even into the palace of the high priest: and he sat with the servants, and warmed himself at the fire.

55 And the chief priests and all the council sought for witness against Jesus to put him to death; and found none. 56 For many bare [g] false witness against him, but

[g] Ps. 35. 11.

---

sion *with him*, or as Fritzsche interprets *to him*, was suspected by Mill (§ 409), and is omitted by Tischendorf on the authority of ℵDLΔ and 69, as also of the Italic, Vulgate, and Ethiopic versions, &c. The phrase is more likely, however, to have been wilfully dropped than to have been wilfully added. It should no doubt be rendered as in our Authorized Version. See Luke xxiii, 55; Acts ix, 39; x, 23, 45; xi, 12; xv, 38, and also John xi, 33. And the reference is not, as Meyer supposes, to our Lord, but to the High Priest.

VER. 54. Compare Matt. xxvi, 58; Luke xxii, 54, 55; John xviii, 15—18. ———*And Peter followed him afar off*:-Or, as Mace, Campbell, Norton give it, *at a distance*, or, according to the Greek idiom, *from a distance.*———*Even into*:-The original phrase is repetitious, *until to-within into* (ἕως ἔσω εἰς). ———*The palace of the High Priest*:-Or rather *the hall* (viz. of the High Priest's palace), the interior *court* or *quadrangle*, around which the chambers of the residence were constructed.———*And he sat with the servants*:-Literally, *he was sitting.* The mind is thrown anticipatively forward to something special that occurred *while he was sitting.* There would be quite a crowd of servants and hangers-on, the sweepings of the band which had gone to Gethsemane. Hence Peter would expect to get jostled into the heart of the crowd unobserved. ———*And warming himself at the fire*:-Literally, *toward the fire;* more literally still, *toward the light.* The preposition brings into view, *that he turned himself toward the fire*, in order to get warmed. The word *light*, again, brings into view the *blazing* of the fire,—by which his countenance would be illuminated and thus by and by identified. The word is everywhere else translated *light.*

VERSES 55—64 constitute a paragraph corresponding to Matt. xxvi, 59—66. The narratives in Luke and John are much more fragmentary.

VER. 55. *But the chief priests and the whole council*: Or, *the whole Sanhedrim.* It was an informal meeting of the Sanhedrim, and the members present seemed to be animated with the same deeply prejudiced spirit that was dominating the High Priest.———*Sought-for*:-The verb is in the imperfect, *were engaged in seeking-for.*———*Testimony against Jesus*: It was right in them to require testimony. But it was iniquitous for them to go hunting for it *against* the prisoner at their bar. Such prejudication and partizanship were a virtual abdication of their function as judges.———*To put him to death*:-This laid the cope-stone on their iniquity. They not only prejudged the case, they were eager to inflict the highest penalty possible. Their eagerness resolved itself into the spirit of murder.———*And found none*:—Literally, *and did not find;* more literally still, *and were not finding* (it). This was what *went on* in the court for a time.

VER. 56. *For many bare false witness against him*:-Literally, *were bearing false witness.* There was a succession of cases.———*But*:-Strictly *and* (καί). The clause introduced forms part of the succession of things.———*Their witness agreed not together*:-Literally, *the testimonies were not equal.* They did

their witness agreed not together. 57 And there arose certain, and bare false witness against him, saying, 58 We heard him say, [h]I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and within three days I will build another made without hands. 59 But neither so did their witness agree together. 60 [i]And the high priest stood up in the midst, and asked Jesus, saying, Answerest thou nothing? what *is it which* these witness against thee?

[h] Mark 15. 29. John 2. 19.

[i] Mat. 26. 62.

---

not tally, or match, the one with the other. Hence there was a difficulty in getting the sentence desired, for two accordant witnesses, at the least, were indispensable. See Deut. xvii, 6.

VER. 57. *And some arose and bore false witness against him, saying*:-This case was worthy of specification. They *bore* false witness. They persisted in it for a time. The verb is in the imperfect.

VER. 58. *We heard him saying, I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and within three days, I will build another made without hands*:-Of course the Saviour never made any such statement. See John ii, 19. He made a mystic reference, indeed, to his own death and resurrection. But he never intimated that he would destroy any temple whatsoever. Neither did he distinguish, at that time, between a temple made with human hands, and another made without such hands. The expression *within three days* should rather be *in three days*, for the phrase does not intimate that the period required would be *less than three days*. It is literally, *through three days*. Our Saviour, *in passing through three days*, would accomplish the work of which he spoke.

VER. 59. *But neither so* :-Literally, *and not even so*, that is, *and not even to that extent*,—nor even to the extent of the allegation, as given summarily in the preceding verse.——*Was their testimony equal* :-The witnesses had so much in common, that they were sure that the Lord had said something or other about the "destruction of the temple," and something or other about "raising it again in three days." But they differed in the details of their testimony, which was consequently so vitiated that a conviction could not be obtained. It would appear that either the witnesses were, as Meyer supposes, examined separately, or else that they got positive in contradicting one another.

VER. 60. *And the High Priest rose up in the midst* :-More literally, *into the midst*. He would seem to have stepped forward nearer the prisoner at his bar. ——*And interrogated Jesus, saying, Answerest thou nothing? What do these testify against thee?*-Instead of this double interrogation, Luther gives it thus, *Answerest thou nothing to that which these testify against thee?* So the Vulgate before him, and Baumgarten-Crusius, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Bleek. But the two interrogatories are more in harmony, at once with the nature of the phraseology, and with the exasperated spirit of the interrogator. He had been baffled, and was chagrined. Laying aside everything like judicial impartiality and calmness, he chides our Lord for his dignified silence amid the Babel of accusation,—*Answerest thou nothing?* He would have liked that our Lord had lost command of his reticence, and had returned railing for railing. When he added, *What do these testify against thee?* the meaning is, *Though the*

61 But he held his [j] peace, and answered nothing. Again the high priest asked him, and said unto him, Art thou the [k] Christ, the [l] Son of the Blessed? 62 And Jesus said, I am: and ye shall [m] see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and [n] com-

[j] Isa. 53. 7. 1 Pet. 2. 23.
[k] Psa. 2. 2.
[l] Psa. 2. 7.
[m] Rev. 1. 7.
[n] Dan. 7. 13.

Mat. 25. 31. Mat. 26. 64.

---

*testimonies of those witnesses do not quite agree in details, yet there was evidently something extraordinary said by them on the occasion referred to. What was it?* It was a most improper question.—The construction of a double interrogation has been accepted, not only by our Authorized Translators, but likewise by Erasmus, Tyndale, Castellio, Beza, Bengel, Meyer.

VER. 61. *But he was silent, and answered nothing*:—He could not descend, even for a moment, from the pinnacle of true dignity, on which he stood. It was no part of his duty, as a defendant, to unravel the contradictions of his unprincipled accusers.———*Again the High Priest interrogated him, and says to him, Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?* This was a legitimate question to put. It was quite right to call upon our Lord to declare who and what he was. It is right that every man in society should be prepared to tell who and what he is. No man can have a legitimate claim to the privileges of society who cannot give account of himself. The expressions employed by the High Priest were taken from the second Psalm, which was then considered to be Messianic, and which can never be rationally interpreted on any other hypothesis. See verses 2, 7.—*The Blessed*: An indefinite appellative way of referring to God, who is emphatically *the Blessed One*. The word is not here, as in 1 Tim. i. 11 and vi. 15, equivalent to *happy* (μακάριος). It represents the Lord as the appropriate object of *eulogy* or *praise* (εὐλογητός).

VER. 62. *But Jesus said, I am*: It was the fitting time and place to declare, in terms the most unequivocal and unmistakable, that he was the Divine Messiah.———*And ye shall see*—sooner or later—*the Son of man*:—While our Lord was in the very act of avowing that he was *the Son of God*, he delights to think and speak of himself as *the Son of man*. He realized his identification with the human family.———*Sitting on the right hand of power*:—Very literally, *of the power*, i. e. *of the supreme power*. He represents himself as seated at the right hand of the absolute and irresistible Sovereign of the Universe. As *Son of man*, indeed, he was essentially subordinate to the Father, so as to have his appropriate place in a secondary position. But as *Son of God*, he was fit to sit on the throne with his Father. Compare the 1st verse of that remarkable Messianic Psalm, the 110th.———*And coming in the clouds of heaven*:—Literally, *with the clouds of the heaven*, that is, encompassed with them.—*Coming*: Namely, to judge the world, and thus to judge the judges who were now judging him. When Jesus shall thus come, he will not be alone. He will indeed be the active agent in conducting the judgement, for "the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgement to the Son" (John v, 22). But the Father—'the Ancient of days'—will be present (Dan. vii, 9), a 'very present' Assessor on the one throne of judgement, and rejoicing that his mind can be infallibly manifested through him, who is '*a* Word,' and '*the* Word,' and '*his* Word.' How august the self-consciousness of our Lord,

ing in the clouds of heaven. 63 Then the high priest [o] rent his clothes, and saith, What need we any further witnesses? 64 Ye have heard the blasphemy: what think ye? And they all condemned him to be guilty of [p] death.

[o] Gen. 37. 29. Jud. 11. 35. Lev. 10. 6. Joel 2. 13.
[p] Lev. 24. 16.

---

to realize all this, at the very moment when he was standing like a felon at the High Priest's bar!

VER. 63. *But the high priest rent his clothes*:-No doubt in some normal and formal manner. In a primitive state of society, indeed, when inward feeling is, with but little restraint, immediately mirrored in outward action, the tearing of one's robes, violently, might often occur; and when it did occur, it would be expressively indicative of a perfect tumult of passion. See Gen. xxxvii, 29; Judg. xi, 35; Job i, 20; Isai. xxxvi, 22; xxxvii, 1 But in a more disciplined condition, when art has been interwoven with nature, and restrains it at almost every point of the warp, the tearing of the robes, when there is a wish to convey the impression that something dreadful has occurred, must be regarded as an entirely artificial symbolism. In the case before us the High Priest would probably be careful to regulate the rending, both topically and longitudinally, according to the rules of the most approved Rabbinical etiquette. See *Commentary on Matthew* xxvi, 65.—*Clothes*:-Or, literally, *tunics*. It is the word—but in the plural—which is almost always rendered *coat* in the Authorized Version, as distinguished from the loose outer robe or *cloke*. It had only the remotest analogy, however, to a European *dress-coat*. The poor contented themselves with wearing one tunic. The rich in general wore two,—the inner one plain and of fine linen, the outer ornamental and of stronger stuff. See Braunius *de Vestitu Sacerdotum Hebræorum*, p. 554. The High Priest, when rending his tunics, would have on his unofficial robes. See Braunius, p. 842.———*And saith, What need we any farther witnesses?*-Very literally, *Why still have we need of witnesses?* That is, *Why should any one suppose that we still require witnesses in this case, ere we could be warranted to come to a judgement?* See next verse.

VER. 64. *Ye have heard*:-Literally, *ye heard*, viz. within the last few moments.———*The blasphemy*:-The defamation of God, of which this man was guilty. The High Priest, in his self-sufficiency, did not distinguish between *a claim*, and *a false claim*. If our Lord's claim to be *the Christ, the Son of the Blessed*, had been false, it would have been a blasphemy. But no evidence had been led to show that it was false. And the High Priest was travelling far beyond his judicial function when he merely assumed that it was. If there was any foundation for the existence and maintenance of the office of the High Priesthood among the Jews, or for the existence and maintenance of the other peculiarities of Judaism, some One, at some time or other, must appear as *the Christ, the Son of the Blessed*. Why might not our Lord be that One?———*What think ye?*-Literally, *what appears to you?* That is, *What appears to you to be the desert of this blasphemer?*———*And they all condemned him to be guilty of death*:-The meaning is not, *that they condemned him to die*. They had not such power (John xviii, 31). But they passed sentence on him as one who had, in their judgement, brought himself *within the grip of the penalty of death*,—as

65 And some began to [q] spit on him, and to cover his face, and to buffet him, and to say unto him, Prophesy: and the servants did strike him with the palms of their hands.

[q] Isa. 50. 6. Mark 15. 19.

66 [r] And as Peter was beneath in the palace, there

[r] Mat. 26. 69. Luke 22. 55. John 18. 16.

---

one consequently who should be delivered over to the Roman Governor to be dealt with according to their finding. See Chap. iii, 29. The word *guilty* has a far-off connection with *gilding* and *gold*, and has thus embedded in it a reference to that which is *precious*. *Guilt* was in some respects *a price*. It often merged in *a price*. It could be replaced or cancelled by *a price*. A person offending *had a price to pay*. The *price* was a penalty. A *guilty* man is one who is *liable to 'pay' a penalty*. The expression *guilty of death*, means *liable to pay the penalty of death*. The word rendered *guilty* is translated, *in danger of*, in Matt. v, 21, 22; Mark iii, 29. It literally means, *in the grip of*. Tyndale renders it here, *worthy of*.

VER. 65. Compare for parallel statements Matt. xxvi, 67, 68, and Luke xxii, 63—65. The wild-beast element was stirred in the breasts of some of the baser beings around our Lord.———*And some began to spit on him*:–Alas. But "this," says Richard Baxter, "the Son of God endured for our sins."——— *And to cover his face, and to buffet him, and say unto him, Prophesy*:–That is, *Tell us by inspiration who the individual was who struck thee*. The word *buffet* means to *cuff*, to *strike with the fists*. Tyndale's translation is, *and to bete him with fistes;* Wycliffe's, *and smyte him with boffatis* (i.e. *buffets*).———*And the servants did strike him with the palms of their hands*:–A free translation of a tinkered text. The word rendered *the palms of their hands* means *slaps*, or *blows*, (ῥαπίσμασιν). See the marginal readings in John xviii, 22, xix, 3. The verb rendered *did strike* (ἔβαλλον) is a transcriber's substitute for a different verb altogether, which means *received* (ἔλαβον). This latter is the reading of ℵABCIKLNSVΓΔΠ; and so, in substance, of DG, 1, 69. It must be genuine. The meaning is,—*the servants received him with blows*, that is, they *received him into custody* till the regular meeting of the Sanhedrim, which could not be held sooner than in the morning: but the moment he was committed to them, they *received him with blows*. Alas. And yet no wonder. They but imitated their superiors. "Like Master, like Man," says Petter.

VERSES 66—72. The episode of Peter's lamentable fall and speedy penitence. Compare, for corresponding paragraphs, Matt. xxvi, 69–75; Luke xxii, 54—62; John xviii, 15—18, and 25—27.

VER. 66. *And*:–The narrative goes back a little. The main current of events was followed to the point recorded in the preceding verse. The evangelist returns thence to take up the following incidents.——— *While Peter was beneath in the palace*:–Or rather, *down in the court*,—that *court* that was open above, and round the sides of which the chambers of the mansion were built.—*Down*:– It is not implied that the apartment in which our Saviour was tried was an upstairs floor or story. It is only implied that the reception-hall, that entered off the quadrangular court, was raised a little above its level. There would perhaps be only a curtain intervening, which would be opened

cometh one of the maids of the high priest: 67 and when she saw Peter warming himself, she looked upon him, and said, And thou also wast with Jesus of Nazareth. 68 But he denied, saying, I know not, neither understand I what thou sayest. And he went out into the porch; and the cock crew. 69 And a maid saw him again, and began to say to them

---

and closed as servants or others entered or retired. See Luke xxii, 61. ——*There cometh one of the maids of the high priest*:–Excited by what was transpiring in the reception-hall, and eager to get talking about it to the people.

VER. 67. *And seeing Peter warming himself, she looked on him*:–She was led to fix her eyes on him. Something in his appearance stirred her recollections. ——*And says, And thou also wast with Jesus of Nazareth*:–Literally, *Thou, too, wast with the Nazarene, Jesus.* See, in particular, the modern critical editions.

VER. 68. *But*:–Now was Peter's time for acting a hero's part, *but.*——*He denied, saying, I know not*:–A broken statement. He meant, *I do not know him.* See Luke xxii, 57. But in his agitation he only got the length of *I do not know*, and then he takes up another line of self-defence.——*Neither do I understand what thou sayest*: In the original of the correct text the language is singularly indicative either of Galilean rudeness of speech, or of agitation, or of both combined, (σὺ τί λέγεις).——*And he went out into the porch*:–With all his assumed hardihood, he trembled in his skin, and felt that the sooner he got more into the shade the better. So he left the vicinity of the blazing fire, and returned into *the vestibule*, or the arched entrance-passage which extended from the great outside gate to the quadrangle of the court.——*And the cock crew*:–Or rather, *and 'a' cock crowed.* It was distinctly audible, and though it did not succeed in touching the deepest spring in Peter's heart, yet no doubt it would excite some tremulous emotion,—*What! is the prediction to be literally fulfilled after all? And yet this prisoner, being a prisoner, cannot surely be the Messiah for whom we hoped, and in whom I misplaced so fondly and devotedly my confidence.*

VER. 69. *And a maid*:–It is *the maid* in the Original,—no doubt the same maid, although there is no reason whatever why we should not suppose that she had some companion or companions, who would take a part in the conversation. Hence we read in Matthew of *another maid.* Luke refers to *others* who were *males.*——*Seeing him again, began to say*:–Tischendorf reads, under the authority of ℵCLΔ, *seeing him, began again to say.* But there can be little doubt that the same reason, which led our translators to say *a maid*, led the transcribers, on whose authority the reading of ℵCLΔ rests, to shift the position of the *again.* Under the pressure of the same supposed difficulty the *again* was sometimes altogether dropped out, as in the Vatican Manuscript, and in the Coptic, Sahidic, and Æthiopic versions.——*To them that stood by, This is (one) of them*:–She was confident, notwithstanding his strong denial, that she had seen him with the Nazarene, probably in the temple-area. And she would be able also to see self-consciousness and self-condemnation in his face.

that stood by, This is *one* of them. 70 And he denied it again. And a little after, they that stood by said again to Peter, Surely thou art *one* of them: for thou art a [s] Galilæan, and thy speech agreeth *thereto*. 71 But [s] Acts 2. 7. he began to curse and to swear, *saying*, I know not this man of whom ye speak. 72 And the second time the cock crew. And Peter called to mind the word that Jesus said unto him, [t] Before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny [t] Verse 30.

---

VER. 70. *But he again denied*:-Poor fellow! He was in the hands of the Philistines and of his conscience.———*And after a little, again they who stood by said to Peter, Surely thou art of them*:-Instead of *again*, Wycliffe has, throughout the whole of this paragraph, the fine old word *eftsoone*, i. e. *soon after*.—*Surely*: This word is now too hesitative. It is *truly* in the original, that is *certainly*, or *without doubt*. Wycliffe, *verily*.———*For thou art a Galilean*:-There is an untranslatable *and* in the original before these words. But it is very significant. It suggests, on the one hand, that there were other things that proved that Peter belonged to the circle of the Nazarene; but asserts on the other that this was an additional proof. His accent bewrayed him to be a Galilean, and, if a Galilean, what was he doing skulking about in the High Priest's house if he was not one of the 'set'?———*And thy speech agreeth thereto*:-This clause is omitted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles. It is wanting in the manuscripts ℵBCDL, I, and was wanting in the copies before Eusebius and Augustin, as also in the Sahidic and Coptic versions. It was most likely imported from Matt. xxvi, 73.

VER. 71. *But he began to curse*:-"As if he should say, the curse of God alight upon me, if I know him," (Petter).———*And to swear, I know not this man of whom ye speak*:-Ah Peter, Alas!

VER. 72. *And*:-The word *immediately* is added in ℵBDGL, 69, and in the Old-Latin, Vulgate, Syriac-Peshito, Armenian, and Æthiopic versions. No doubt it is genuine. It is received by Griesbach, Lachmann, Fritzsche, Tischendorf, Tregelles.———*The second time a cock crowed. And Peter called to mind the word that Jesus said unto him*: More literally, *and Peter was reminded of the saying, how that Jesus said to him*.———*Before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny me thrice. And when he thought thereon, he wept*: Our translators have happily hit upon the true import of the last clause (*καὶ ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλαιεν*). The Geneva version pointed in the same direction, but not, by any means, so felicitously as our Translators,—*And waying* (i. e. weighing) *that with himselfe, he wept*. The word rendered *when he thought thereon*, has been puzzling to interpreters from the earliest times. "There are not many words in Scripture," says Bland, "which have undergone more interpretations than this." The Vulgate version renders the whole phrase thus, *and he began to weep*. So the Old-Latin before it, and the Peshito-Syriac, Philoxenian-Syriac, Sahidic, Armenian, and Gothic versions. So too Erasmus, Luther, Tyndale, Coverdale, and many others. The Cambridge Manuscript (D) actually cancels the original phrase, and substitutes—no doubt out of a marginal gloss—the common word for *began* (*ἤρξατο κλαίειν*). Faber Stapulensis, having the same view of the import of the phrase, gave, as far as possible, a fine idiomatic turn

me thrice. And [5] when he thought thereon, he [u] wept.

[5] Or, *he wept abundantly; or, he began to weep.*

[u] 2 Cor. 7. 9.

to his translation, *broke forth into weeping* (prorupit in fletum). He was followed by Vatable and Cajetan. It is however, in all its phases, a violent, and indeed—when the participial form of the word is taken into account—impossible rendering.—Theophylact takes an entirely different view of the import of the word. He explains it thus,—*having shrouded his head.* The word etymologically means *having thrown upon.* Theophylact supposes that Peter *buried his head in the folds of his cloak*, and then wept. The great French scholar Salmasius, the antagonist of Milton, was of the same opinion, and quite positive, indeed, that this is the only legitimate interpretation. (See his *Epistola ad Colvium*, pp. 656—7.) Many subsequent critics and expositors,—inclusive of Bos, Wolf, Suicer, Elsner, Krebs, Heumann, Mace, Fritzsche,—coincided in his judgement. In the absence, however, of any word to suggest the idea of *robe* or *cloak*, the interpretation is violent, and the expression, so interpreted, would be unexampled.—Grotius, followed by Le Clerc, thought that the phrase was a kind of Hebraism,—*and adding he wept*, that is, *and in addition he wept*, or, *and he wept also.* The guilty apostle *not only recollected* his Lord's prediction, *he added weeping to his recollection.* But this is, almost as much as Theophylact's, a violent and unlikely interpretation. Bleek, however, misunderstanding it, thought that Grotius and Le Clerc wished to interpret the expression thus, *he wept still more*; and this misconception of their meaning he adopts as the true interpretation of the evangelist's phrase, though he admits that there is nothing in what goes before to lead us to suppose that Peter had formerly wept. He thinks it likely, however, that Mark tacitly assumed *that the apostle had wept at the first crowing of the cock.* Most unlikely.—Beza interprets the expression thus,—*And when he had rushed forth* (from the high priest's house) *he wept.* The force of the participial word, however, he admits to be such, that the meaning is not so much, *he rushed forth 'from'* (the high priest's house), as, *he threw himself 'upon'* (the place that was beyond). Henry Stephens endorsed this interpretation, and it is adopted by Piscator, Erasmus Schmid, Felbinger, Raphel, Schleusner, Bretschneider, Wahl, Vater. It is, however, notwithstanding such great names, utterly unworthy of being accepted, except in despair.—Bishop Hammond and Palairet would interpret thus,—*and when he cast* (his eyes on Christ), *he wept.* It is manifestly a suggestion of despair, and clearly inadmissible, unless despair should rise to its maximum. It is Luke alone who mentions the fact that Jesus was visible to Peter, (xxii, 61).—What then? Must we despair? By no means. Our English Translators have given to the word a thoroughly legitimate and idiomatic rendering. The idea is,—*when he threw (his thought) upon* (the prediction which he recollected), *he wept.* As a matter of fact, the word was often employed 'absolutely' by the later Greek writers, with this peculiar idiomatic reference. See a long list of passages in Wetstein, (and compare the secondary meaning of the noun ἐπιβολή). Casaubon finally settled in this interpretation. Wetstein powerfully supported it. And it has been approved of by Petter, Kypke, Pr.

## CHAPTER XV.

*In the morning the Sanhedrim assembled, condemned Jesus, and handed him over to Pilate to be dealt with as one who was guilty of treason to Cæsar,* 1. *Pilate asked him if he was "the King of the Jews," and Jesus answered that he was,* 2. *The chief priests repeated and re-repeated their accusation; but Jesus maintained a dignified silence, which astonished Pilate,* 3—5. *As it was the custom of the Roman Procurator to release a prisoner to the people at passover time, Pilate wished to release Jesus, but the people, under the instigation of the chief priests, demanded Barabbas in preference,* 6—11. *In reference to Jesus, they shouted out, "Crucify him!"* 12—14. *Pilate yielded to the popular clamour, and surrendered the Saviour to be crucified,* 15. *The Roman soldiers tried to make sport out of him,* 16—19; *and then led him off to be crucified,* 20. *Simon of Cyrene was impressed to assist in bearing the cross,* 21. *Golgotha is at length reached,* 22, *and there they crucified the Lord of glory,* 23—25. *An inscription of his accusation was put over his head, "The King of the Jews,"* 26. *Two robbers were crucified with him, one on his right hand, and one on his left,* 27, 28. *While hanging on the cross in agony, he was cruelly reviled by casual passers-by, as also by the chief priests,* 29—32. *From the sixth hour to the ninth, there was a praeternatural darkness over the scene,* 33. *At the ninth hour our Lord called out aloud "My God, my God, why forsookest thou me?" and soon thereafter expired,* 34—37. *The vail of the temple was rent in two,* 38. *The Roman centurion was profoundly impressed,* 39. *The holy women looked on from a distance,* 40, 41. *Joseph of Arimathea asked the body from Pilate, got it, and deposited it in a tomb,* 42—46. *The holy women beheld where the body was laid,* 47.

[a] AND straightway in the morning the chief [a] Mat. 27. 1. Luke 23. 1. John 18. 28.

---

Campbell, Glöckler, de Wette, Bland, Bloomfield, Alexander, Meyer, Bisping, Grimm, Godwin, Volkmar.—*He wept*:—The verb is in the imperfect tense, and suggests more than a mere outburst of tears. His tears kept flowing.

## CHAPTER XV.

THE tragical story hastens to its consummation. There is no pause, on the writer's part, for emphasising, or moralising, or philosophising, or

priests held a consultation with the elders and scribes and the whole council, and bound Jesus, and carried *him* away,

---

even theologising. There is the most perfect simplicity and artlessness of narration.

The events narrated happened in the course of a single day,—"dark and dreary." It was the very day before the Jewish Sabbath,—Friday, which hence became the most historical of all Fridays,—the first '*Good* Friday.' All that our Lord did, while enduring the pangs that were thrust into him, and the woes that were heaped upon him, was pre-eminently '*good*' *in him*, and pre-eminently '*good*' *for man.*

Verses 1—5 constitute a condensed paragraph, corresponding in its brief outlines to the fuller details in Matt. xxvii, 1, 2, 11—14; Luke xxiii, 1—16; and John xviii, 28—38.

Ver. 1. *And straightway*:—Or *immediately*,—one of Mark's favourite words. It is not to be interconnected with the following expression, as if the meaning were, *as soon as it was morning.* The idea rather is, that no delay was required in the way of waiting for the morning. The morning was just about to break as the preliminary meeting in the high priest's house drew to a close.———*In the morning*:—Literally, according to the text that was before our Translators, *on the morning*, that is, *on the occurrence of the morning.* The preposition and the article are both wanting, however, in the texts of Lachmann, Tischendorf (8th), Tregelles. But it seems less likely that they would be added by a critical transcriber, than that they would be subtracted.———*The chief priests held a consultation with the elders and scribes and the whole council*:—One would be apt to infer, from this translation, that it was the evangelist's intention to represent the chief priests as initiating the consultation with the whole council. But that is not quite the idea, though no doubt the chief priests would, as a matter of fact, be prominent. The expression is complicated, but may be represented thus,—*the-chief-priests-with-the-elders-and-the-scribes, even the whole Sanhedrim, held a consultation.* The evangelist first specifies the component elements in the membership of the Sanhedrim, and then adds, in an artless manner, the sum-total composed.———*Held a consultation*:—Very literally, *made counsel*, that is, *took counsel together.* Three uncial manuscripts, ℵCL, read *prepared counsel;* and Tischendorf has received this word into the text of his 8th edition. But it is likely to have been a graphical error.———*And bound Jesus*:—They caused him to be manacled, that he might be impeded in any attempt to escape. He was treated as a convicted criminal. It is probable that, for form's sake, they would try him afresh, though hurriedly, and making use of the finding of the extemporized meeting in the high priest's residence. ———*And carried him away*:—*Bore him off* from the Sanhedrim-house. It is an idiomatic expression, denoting forcible transference of the person. Origen has *led off*, instead of *carried off;* and so too do the manuscripts CDGN and 1 read,—tinkeringly however. Compare Matt. xxvii, 2.———*And delivered him to Pilate*:—That he might adjudge him to death. See John xviii, 31. After Archelaus, son and successor of Herod the Great, had been banished by the Roman emperor to Gaul, Judæa was added to the province of Syria, and governed by deputies, called Procurators. Of these Pontius Pilate was the fifth.

and delivered *him* to Pilate. 2 And Pilate asked him, Art thou the King of the Jews? And he answering said unto him, Thou sayest *it*. 3 And the chief priests accused him of many things: but he answered nothing. 4 And Pilate asked him again, saying, Answerest thou nothing? behold how many

---

VER. 2. *And Pilate asked him*: Or, *put the following question to him*, no doubt among other interrogatories. Though by no means remarkable for uprightness, he had too much of the Roman spirit of justice in him, to pass summary sentence, on the simple representation of the Sanhedrim.———*Art thou the King of the Jews?* Or, assumingly, and with a dash of mingled *nonchalance* and sarcasm, *Thou art the King of the Jews?—Thou art, I believe, the King of the Jews!* The Sanhedrim had obviously informed the Procurator that the prisoner, who was delivered up to him, was aiming at the Jewish crown, and that therefore the case submitted to his lordship's administrative decision, was one of treason,—a capital crime.———*And he, answering, said unto him*:—Or, as it is in the manuscripts ℵBCD, *says to him*. We listen as he speaks, as if we had been 'present.'———*Thou sayest*: Theophylact supposes that our Lord returned to Pilate an intentionally ambiguous answer, that might be understood as meaning, either, *Thou sayest truly what I am*, or, *I do not say that, but thou*. The expression, however, was a strong, though strange, idiomatic affirmation, precisely equivalent to, *I am*. Compare Matt. xxvi, 64 with Mark xiv, 62. Norton renders it, *I am;* Mace, *Yes;* Zinzendorf and Godwin, *As thou sayest;* Newcome and Edgar Taylor, *Thou sayest truly;* Principal Campbell, *Thou sayest right*. The rationale of the idiom is, that *when the interrogative form is withdrawn from the class of interrogations referred to, the saying that remains is the reality*. One sees, readily and clearly, the perfect pertinency of the idiom, when the interrogative form of the utterance is found exclusively in the peculiarity of the intonation, and not in any peculiarity in the collocation of the vocables,—as, for example, in the case before us, *Thou art the King of the Jews?*

VER. 3. *And the chief priests accused him of many things*:—Or, *accused him much*. The reference is rather to a multiplicity of allegations, than to a multiplicity of misdemeanours. They made 'a great ado,' and used, repetitiously, a multitude of words, in making and enforcing their charge. The word rendered *many things* (πολλά) is often used idiomatically as equivalent to *much*. It is so rendered in Mark i, 45; v, 10; John xiv, 30; Rom. xvi, 6, 12; Rev. v, 4. Luther's version corresponds, *accused him 'hard,'* or *'sore,'* as Coverdale renders it. Zinzendorf uses the German word corresponding etymologically to *sore*, viz. *sehr*, that is, "very (much)."———*But he answered nothing*:—This clause seems to have been imported from Matt. xxvii, 12. It is wanting in all the best manuscripts and versions, and is omitted by all the modern editors, inclusive of Griesbach and Scholz. By Bengel too.

VER. 4. *And Pilate asked him again*: Or rather, *And Pilate again interrogated him*. The question put by the Procurator was different from that which he previously asked.———*Answerest thou nothing?*—Or, *Art thou not answering anything?* He was surprised at his calm dignified reticence amid the Babel of accusation.———*Behold, how many things they witness against thee*:—Or, as it is

things they witness against thee. 5 But Jesus yet answered nothing; so that Pilate marvelled.

6 [b]Now at *that* feast he released unto them one prisoner, whomsoever they desired. 7 And there was *one* named Barabbas, *which lay* bound with

[b] Mat. 27. 15. Luke 23. 17. John 18. 39.

---

in ℵBCD, l, and in the Italic and Vulgate versions, as also in the texts of Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, *Behold, how many things they accuse thee of!* Tischendorf thinks that the reading of the Received Text has been borrowed from Matt. xxvii, 13. Not improbably.—*How many things*:–The expression is the reflex of the plural phrase employed in verse 3, and should be interpreted in the light of the import of that phrase. Luther maintains his consistency. *See how hard they accuse thee!* Meyer's version is, *See how much they testify against thee!* So Godwin.

Ver. 5. *But Jesus still answered nothing*:–Namely, to the accusations made against him by the chief priests. Although invited, as it were, by the Procurator to speak out in self-defence, he maintained a perfect and dignified silence.———*So that Pilate marvelled*:–It was an unwonted spectacle at his bar. He would be accustomed to stormy scenes of fierce and fiery recrimination.

Verses 6—15 may be compared, as a Paragraph, with Matt. xxvii, 15—26, Luke xxiii, 17—25, and with John xviii, 39, 40, &c. The Procurator cannot in his conscience acquiesce in the decision of the Sanhedrim, but he weakly yields.

Ver. 6. *But at that feast*:–It is a very idiomatic phrase in the original, denoting a course of time, extending down from feast to feast in annual recurrence,—*But feast by feast*, that is, *But at every recurring Passover.*———*He released*:–The verb is in the imperfect tense,—*he was accustomed to release.*———*To them*:–The reference has expanded, in the evangelist's mind, from the authorities of the nation to the people in general.———*One prisoner, whomsoever they desired*:–Or, *whom in particular they asked* (ὅνπερ ᾐτοῦντο). But the three oldest manuscripts—the Sinaitic (ℵ), the Alexandrine (A), and the Vatican (B)—have a slightly different reading (ὃν παρῃτοῦντο), *whom they begged*, or *whom they petitioned for*. The compound word is translated *intreated* in Hebrews xii, 19. Tischendorf has received it into his 8th edition of the Text; with probability.—It may seem strange that it should be regarded as a favour to a people to get the release of a prisoner. But sometimes noble men have been imprisoned for noble deeds. And often, when a people has been subjected to a foreign yoke, the patriotic and heroic have had to suffer with felons in their cells.

Ver. 7. *And there was one named Barabbas*:–There was *the so-called Barabbas*. The spirit of the representation would not be greatly exaggerated, if we rendered the expression thus, *there was the notorious Barabbas*. This freebooter would seem to have been of respectable parentage, though he had gravitated into the profession of a brigand. The word *Barabbas* means *Son-of-Father*, that is *Son-of-Father (so and so)*. He had been the son, apparently, of some *Rabbi*, who was highly esteemed, and called *Father*, in his circle.———*Who lay bound with them that had made insurrection with him*:–That is, *with his*

them that had made insurrection with him, who had committed [c]murder in the insurrection. 8 And the multitude crying aloud began to desire *him to do* as he had ever done unto them.

[c] Acts 3. 14.

9 But Pilate answered them, saying, Will ye that I release

---

*fellow-rioters.* In some of the best manuscripts, however, such as ℵCBDK, 1, 69, the word for *fellow* is omitted,—*with the rioters.* This reading has been approved of by Schulz, and received into the text by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles. It is supported by the Syriac and Vulgate versions, and is, in all likelihood, the autographic. If it be accepted, then there is no explicit statement in the text, to the effect that Barabbas was one of the rioters; yet it is implied. He would, no doubt, be their ringleader.——*Who had committed murder in the insurrection*:–*In the riot.* Note the article,—*in 'the' riot which issued in the imprisonment of Barabbas and the other rioters.* It is a compound and indefinite relative (οἵτινες), which is translated *who.* The idea is, that the rioters had not only been guilty of rioting, they were *such as* had committed murder in the riot. The riot had been got up in antagonism to the authorities, and hence was a kind of *insurrection* on a small scale.

VER. 8. *And the multitude, crying aloud* (ἀναβοήσας) :–Such is the reading of the great majority of the existing manuscripts. But in the Sinaitic, Vatican, and Cambridge Manuscripts (ℵBD) there is a very different reading (ἀναβάς), meaning *going up.* This reading was approved of by David Schulz, and has been received into the text by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford. Griesbach hesitated whether to accept or reject it. (*Com. Crit.* in loc.) It is supported by the Vulgate version, and the Italic; and also by the Coptic, Sahidic, and Gothic. The Æthiopic version combines the two readings, *going up and crying out.* It is more likely, on the whole, that the evangelist's word would be expanded to convey the idea of *crying out,*—an idea in harmony with the usual characteristics of a crowd or mob,—than that it would be contracted or cut down to bring out the idea of *going up,* which, at first sight, seems to be an almost meaningless, if not incongruous, item of information in the narrative. But as Mark was a residenter in Jerusalem (Acts xii, 12), and knew the topography of the city to perfection, nothing after all was more natural than that he should, in his own artless style of composition, use the expression. The Procurator's residence would either be in Herod's palace,—occupying a conspicuously elevated position on Mount Sion,—or in the castle of Antonia at the north-west angle of the Temple area,—also a conspicuously elevated site, down from which, and up to which, the *via dolorosa* leads. The people *needed to go up* to the Procurator.——*Began to desire (him to do) as he had ever done unto them* :–The word *ever* is wanting in the manuscripts ℵBΔ, and in the Syriac-Peshito, Sahidic, and Coptic versions. Tischendorf omits it. And we can easily suppose that it was a marginal expletive. The verb itself brings out a frequentative idea, *as he was accustomed to do to them.* Compare verse 6. *The crowd began to ask (that he should do) as he was wont to do to them.* The preliminaries of this appeal on the part of the populace are not stated by Mark. But see Matt. xxvii, 16—18.

VER. 9. *But Pilate answered them, saying, Will ye that I release* :–Is it your

unto you the King of the Jews? 10 For he knew that the chief priests had delivered him for envy. 11 But the chief priests moved the people, that he should rather release

---

pleasure that I should release.——*Unto you*:–It was the populace he wished to gratify. And most likely he would not have regretted, but rather rejoiced, if the choice of the populace had been at variance with the wishes of the High Priest's party.——*The King of the Jews*:–There might be a mingle ment of feelings prompting the Procurator to use this expression. Very possibly there would be something of only half-concealed sarcasm and contempt. But very likely, too, he might know that only a few days ago the Prisoner had entered the city in a kind of triumphal manner, as if he were some royal personage; and that he was received as such by the populace. Knowing this, in part perhaps by the accusations of the chief priests, and in part perhaps by previous report or distant personal observation, he might wish to show the people that, as a faithful and loyal Roman, he was not in the least jealous of Jesus as a rival to the Emperor. He really had no sympathy with the representations of the Sanhedrim. He did not believe that any political complication was intended by the Prisoner, or that there was any danger of insubordination and insurrection. If therefore they would take it as a compliment that one, whom only a few days before they had hailed as *the king of the Jews*, should be set at liberty, he intimated that he would be glad to gratify them.

VER. 10. *For he knew that the chief priests had delivered him for envy*:–Or, *on account of envy*. Wakefield renders the word too generically, *hatred*. Mace and Norton, also too generically, *malice*. It was *envy* that was the deepest feeling in their spirits. They saw that Jesus was getting a hold of the hearts and consciences of the people, in a way, and to a degree, that was quite beyond their reach. They hence concluded that if he was not arrested in his career, he would gradually make himself the living centre of such an extended spiritual interest, that they would be left outside, high and dry! They could not bear the prospect. The expression, *on account of envy*, stands emphatically, in the original, in the front of the sentence,—*for he knew that on account of envy the chief priests had delivered him up*.—It is well to say, *delivered him up*, rather than simply *delivered him*, as *delivered*, when used absolutely, is apt to suggest the idea of *deliverance* in the sense of *liberation*. The chief priests, however, had nothing further from their intent than liberation. They handed our Lord over to Pilate, that he might receive from the hands of the Roman a severer handling than could be given to him in their own hands. See on chap. ix, 31.

VER. 11. *But the chief priests*:–Wycliffe here gives the strange translation, *the bischopis*, i.e. *the bishops*.——*Moved the people*:–*Moved* is scarcely strong enough (ἀνέσεισαν). They *'stireden' the cumpenye of peple*, as Wycliffe has it. They *urged* or *instigated* them. Mace and Principal Campbell have *incited*.—*The people*:–That is, the people there assembled, *the crowd*.——*That*:–Literally, *in order that*. What follows brings out the aim they had in view.——*He might rather release Barabbas to them*:–Any one rather than Jesus. They would represent to the people that Jesus was so insidiously dangerous to their interests and principles, that the greatest scoundrel or free-booter in the country would do less harm than he.

Barabbas unto them. 12 And Pilate answered and said again unto them, What will ye then that I shall do *unto him* whom [d]ye call the King of the Jews? 13 And they cried out again, Crucify him. 14 Then Pilate said unto them, Why, what evil hath he done? And they cried out the more exceedingly, Crucify him.

15 And *so* Pilate, willing to content the people, released

[d] Chap. 11. 9. John 12. 13.

---

VER. 12. The fickle crowd yielded to the priestly pressure.——*And Pilate answered, and said again to them*:-In ℵBC, and 33 "the queen of the cursives," the *again* comes in connection with the word *answered*,—*But Pilate again answered, and said to them.* This connection is favoured by the Vulgate, Sahidic, Philoxenian-Syriac, Æthiopic, and Gothic versions, and by Augustin in his *Consensus*. The position is of little exegetical moment. Pilate did not 'give in' without making another attempt to rescue the innocent Being at his bar.——*What then is it your pleasure that I should do to him whom ye call the King of the Jews?*-He artfully threw the responsibility of the royal designation upon the people, instead of saying *him who calls himself the King of the Jews.* He understood that the meek Being, whose life was at stake, and who would no doubt have a majesty in his bearing far transcending the dignity of the High Priest, was popular with the common people. He knew that they supposed that he had some intimate relation to their inextinguishable national yearnings. He held on, therefore, to the hope that they would not wish him to be given up to an ignominious execution.

VER. 13. *But they cried out again*:-That is, when they did once more tumultuously express their pleasure. They had already shouted out, *Release to us Barabbas!*——*Crucify him!* "The cry of the infatuated rabble really means, Deal with him as you would have dealt with Barabbas," *(Alexander).* It was the voice and concentrated essence of the wild-beast spirit. The chief priests and their associates had breathed it into the people. It is saddening to think how frequently this spirit obtains the ascendant in human affairs. Not only is righteousness outvoted, goodness is overridden roughshod. And, most likely, not until men find out, from bitter experience, that they cannot get up to the heights of prosperity, by going down to the depths of wickedness, will they be persuaded to try the divine way of equity and love.

VER. 14. *But Pilate said to them, Why, what evil hath he done?*-A peculiar idiomatic phrase in Greek. Literally, *For what did he evil?* The *for* points to the suppressed expression of surprise,—*(You surprise me,) for what did he evil?* The Procurator was seeking to introduce an element of reason into the excited populace.——*But they cried out the more exceedingly, Crucify him*:-They were past the stage of reasoning. They were thirsting for blood, and would listen to nothing that seemed to come between them and their thirst. The phrase *the-more-exceedingly* (περισσοτέρως) is positive, instead of comparative, in a very large proportion of the uncial manuscripts, ℵABCDGHKMΔΠ. *They shouted exceedingly.* It was as if showers of shouting fell on the Procurator's ears.

VER. 15. *But Pilate, willing to content the people*:-Very literally, *to do 'the sufficient' to the people*, or, as Wycliffe has it, *to do ynow* (i.e. *enough*) *to the people*, that is, *to 'satisfy' the people*,—to do to the crowd what would be *sufficient*

Barabbas unto them, and delivered Jesus, when he had scourged *him,* to be crucified.

16 [e] And the soldiers led him away into the hall, [e] Mat. 27. 27.
called Prætorium; and they called together the whole band.

---

*to please them.* Pilate was *deliberately desirous* (*βουλόμενος*) of doing this.——*Released Barabbas unto them*:—Or, according to the collocation of the original, *released unto them Barabbas.*——*And delivered up Jesus, when he had scourged him*:—Viz. by the hands of the lictors. (See Stockbauer's *Kunstgeschichte des Kreuzes,* p. 40.) This *scourging* with rods, or with what Horace calls the "horrible flagellum" (Sat. i, 3, 119), was deemed a fitting prelude to crucifixion. (See Lipsius *De Cruce,* ii, 2, 3.) The aim was to make crime as odious as possible, by prefixing pain to pain, and infamy to infamy. The prospect of such anguish and ignominy would be fitted to act, as a deterrent, on the minds of the servile and the selfish. But when justice missed its aim, and punishment fell on the innocent, the pure, and the noble, then the effects on delicate and high-strung sensibility must have been terrible in the extreme. They must have been superlatively so in the case of Jesus.——*To be crucified*:—Literally, *In order that he might be crucified.* The High Priests and their coadjutors gained their end, and yet lost it. They wished to stamp ignominy on the impracticable Galilean Reformer, and to stamp out his reforming influence, as if it were a pest and a disgrace. But his cross has become an actual ornament to beauty, personal and impersonal, wherever civilization has been triumphant. It is the symbol, almost everywhere among the progressive races, of the pathway to the crown. And his reforming influence is silently re-forming society all the world over. "The Stone which the builders disallowed, the same is made the Head of the corner."

Verses 16—20,—a paragraph that opens up to view immeasurable descents of human degradation, and, on the part of our Lord, immeasurable ascents of noble self-sacrifice. It corresponds to Matt. xxvii, 27—31. See also John xix, 2, 3.

Ver. 16. *But the soldiers*: Into whose hands our Lord was committed for execution.——*Led him away into the hall*:—More literally still, *led him off inside the court,*—the open court or quadrangle of the Procurator's mansion-house. Pilate had met the Sanhedrim and the people outside, on the paved esplanade in front of his residence. See John xviii, 28; xix, 13.——*Called Prætorium*: It was not the court, *as distinguished from the buildings that were massed around it,* which was called Prætorium. The whole pile, inclusive of the court, was the *Prætorium,* or *Governor's Residence.* But as the evangelist had, in what precedes, been narrating occurrences which took place outside, he now speaks of the soldiers as entering, what was at once a part and the whole of the pile,—at once the court in particular, and the Prætorium in general. He might have said, *inside the court of the Prætorium.* But he chooses to say *inside the court:* and then he artlessly adds a clause, which determines the particular building referred to, *which is (the) Prætorium.* The word *Prætorium* originally meant the tent or residence of the *Prætor* or *Leader.* But after *leaders* became subdivided into various orders, and only some continued to be called *Prætors,* the name for the residence still retained its generic hold. And

17 And they clothed him with purple, and platted a crown of thorns, and put it about his *head*, 18 and began to salute him, Hail, King of the Jews! 19 And they smote him on the head with a reed, and did [f] spit upon him, and bowing *their* knees worshipped him. 20 And when they had [g] mocked him, they took off the purple from

[f] Chap. 14. 65.

[g] Chap. 10. 34.

---

hence Pilate, though no *Prætor*, resided in a *Prætorium*.——*And they call together the whole band*:—Or *cohort*, which was doing military duty in the city. The rough brutal fellows, accustomed to gladiatorial shows, and other savageries, wanted to get some sport out of their Hebrew prisoner.

VER. 17. *And they clothed him with purple*:—*They invested him with 'a purple,'* that is, *with 'a purple robe.'* It had been apparently some cast-off robe of Herod Antipas. See Luke xxiii, 11.——*And platted a crown of thorns, and put it about his head*: And thus, says Hiller mystically, "as the curse began in thorns (Gen. iii, 18), it ended in thorns," (*Hierophyticon*, I, p. 473). The hardened legionaries, however, thought it splendid drollery. "The thorns," says Malan, "were most likely twigs of the commonest thorn-bush in Pales- "tine, growing everywhere on waste ground, and ready at hand. The branches "are long, slender, and very thorny, though the thorns are far apart; so that "it was well suited to the purpose of the Roman soldiers." (*Notes on John*, p. 127.)

VER. 18. *And began to salute him, Hail, King of the Jews*:—"*Hail*, an ancient form of saluting such as we honour or respect, which signifies as much as *All health to you!*" (Petter.) "Our ancestors," says Verstegan, "used it instead of *Ave*, as a word of most well-wishing." (*Restitution*, p. 247.) The salutation would be the more incisively derisive, that the word rendered *Hail!* literally means *Rejoice!* "Alas, mad sinners," says Richard Baxter, "little know you whom you scorn."

VER. 19. *And they smote him on the head*:—Very literally, *and they smote his head*. Not gently, we fear. They smote him, too, again and again. The verb is in the imperfect tense, and hence Rotherham renders it, *they were striking him*.——*With a reed*:—The particular reed, most probably, which they had attempted to stick into his hand as a sceptre. See Matt. xxvii, 29.——*And did spit on him*:—Repeatedly alas. The verb, like the preceding one, is in the imperfect tense.——*And bowing their knees*:—Literally, *and placing the knees*, namely, in position. Not unlikely, the posture would be a studied imitation of the most obsequious oriental mode.——*Worshipped him*:—Did humble obeisance to him. The whole body would be bent forward, prostratingly and adoringly. The Rheims version is, *adored*. The word *worshipped*—given both by Wycliffe and Tyndale—was formerly employed in a more generic acceptation that what is now common. The expression in Matt. xix, 19, for instance, "*honour* thy father and thy mother," was rendered by Wycliffe "*worshipe* thi fadir and thi modir." Hence, too, certain survivals of complimentary address or designation, "*your worship*," "*worshipful*," as applied to certain 'honourable' magistrates or corporate bodies.

VER. 20. *And when they had mocked him*:—That is, after the mocking was finished. The word rendered *mocked* turns, in its significance, on the idea of

him, and put his own clothes on him, and led him out to crucify him.

21 [h]And they compel one Simon a Cyrenian, who passed by, coming out of the country, the father of Alexander and [i]Rufus, to bear his cross.

[h] Mat. 27. 32. Luke 23. 26.

[i] Rom. 16. 13.

---

the sports of children (ἐνέπαιξαν).———*They took off the purple from him, and put his own clothes on him*:–Tischendorf finishes here a paragraph, and hence commences a new paragraph with the following clause. It is better, however, to make no break. And although it is advantageous, for purposes of arrangement and harmony, to set verses 16—20, and then verses 21—26, respectively, apart as distinct groups or paragraphs, yet there is no real division in the evangelist's composition. He hastens on continuously.———*And led him out that they might crucify him*:–A portion of their number would be told off to see the execution completed.

Verses 21—26 constitute a group or paragraph, corresponding to Matt. xxvii, 31—37, and Luke xxiii, 26—31. Compare also John xix, 17—24.

Ver. 21. *And they compel*:–Or *impress*. The original word is of Persian origin, and derived its conventional acceptation from the Persian postal system. ———*One Simon a Cyrenian, who passed by*:–Or, *a certain individual, passing by, Simon of Cyrene*. There were many Simons, or Simeons, among the early Christians. But this one was distinguished from all the rest as *Simon of Cyrene*,—a great and flourishing city of that North African district, which somewhat corresponds to the modern Tripoli. It lay between the territory of Alexandria on the east, and that of Carthage on the west, and was called Cyrenaica, or Pentapolitana. Cyrene was several miles inland from the Mediterranean Sea, and in virtue of a charter of Ptolemy I, had become a favourite resort of Jews. It is now a heap of ruins, and called *Cairoan*, or *Ghrenna*. (See Bastow's *Bible Dictionary*, p. 202.)———*Coming from the country*:–He was not only *passing by*, he was *on his way 'in from the country,'* and would be totally ignorant of the immense commotion that had been heaving, that morning, the great heart of Jerusalem.———*The father of Alexander and Rufus*:–They are mentioned by name as being well known among the early Christians. They were probably devoted and conspicuous disciples. Paul sends, in his Epistle to the Romans (xvi, 13), a salutation to "Rufus, chosen in the Lord," and to "his mother," concerning whom he adds, most touchingly, "and mine." Possibly this Rufus might be he who is specified by the evangelist. Possibly the whole family may have been converted to Christianity in consequence of the impressment of the father on the streets of Jerusalem. Coming in contact with the Saviour, he might recognise, even in the depth of his humiliation, the unmistakable gleams of his Messiahship, and become inspired with faith and fealty.———*To bear his cross*:–Or, *in order that he might take up his cross*, and carry it when taken up. Our Saviour had been so exhausted in body by his want of rest, and his agony in Gethsemane, and the abuse to which he was subjected in the respective courts in which he had been tried and mocked, that he was unable to drag after him the cross, which had been laid on his shoulder. (See Gruner's *Commentatio de J. Christi morte vera*, pp. 34—37.) It was customary for the great coarse scoundrels, who were condemned to crucifixion, to

22 *j* And they bring him unto the place Golgotha, which is, being interpreted, The place of a skull. *j* Mat. 27. 33. uke 23. 33. John 19. 17.

23 And they gave him to drink wine mingled with myrrh: but he received *it* not.

---

be compelled to carry their crosses to the place of execution. (See Salmasius *De Cruce*, p. 435.) In general they would be quite able to undergo that humiliating preliminary. But Jesus was of a different mould, outwardly and inwardly, and was therefore stumbling and falling under his oppressive burden. Thus it was necessary to impress some one to assist. The soldiers would disdain to lend a helping hand. So would the mob. And hence Simon was eagerly pounced upon, as he was coming in from the country, and perhaps expressing surprise, in a remonstrating manner, that a Being, so evidently different from the criminal class, should be led off toward Golgotha. He was nothing loath to comply with the impressment. He went to the fallen sufferer, and '*lifted up*' the cross. Then placing himself behind the meek mute Burden-Bearer (Luke xxiii, 26), he cheerfully took over on himself the greater portion of the burden, and so got linked for ever to the Lord.

VER. 22. *And they bring him unto the place Golgotha*: Literally, *upon the Golgotha place*. The preposition *upon* thus denotes, not the direction taken, but the position, or super-position, ultimately attained. *Golgotha* represents, in Greek letters, the Chaldaic *Gulgaltha*, or Syriac *Gugaltho*, which is a modification of the Hebrew word *Gulgoleth, a skull*.——*Which is, being interpreted, The place of a skull*:-Or better still, and more literally, *skull-place;* and 'skull-place' is just 'Calvary-place.' When we drop the word "place," as Luke does (xxiii 33), then the Aramaic 'Golgotha' is identical with the Latin 'Calvary,' or the English 'Skull.' It had, no doubt, wherever situated, been a little knoll, or *monticule* of a place,—a kind of '*head*-land,'—somewhat like a rounded skull. It was thus *Mount Calvary* in a certain dwarfish application of the word *Mount*. Its true topography, however, is only matter of conjecture. The current ecclesiastical tradition, that it is embraced within the compass of the present *Church of the Holy Sepulchre*, is imaginary, and evidently apocryphal. For the site of that church is now, and must apparently have been in the Saviour's days, within the circuit of the walls of the city, and not "outside the gate" (Heb. xiii 12). The word *interpreted*, in all the places in which it occurs in the New Testament, has reference to that simplest phase of the interpretation of a foreign word,—*translation*. Rilliet's version of the clause is, *which signifies, when translated, place of the skull.*

VER. 23. *And they gave him to drink*:-The word *gave* is in the imperfect tense, so that the idea is nearly equivalent to this,—*they offered him pressingly.* The expression *to drink* is wanting in the Sinaitic (ℵ), Vatican (B), and Parisian (C*) manuscripts, as also in LΔ, and in the Coptic and Armenian versions. It is omitted from the text by Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, and was condemned by David Schulz. It is certainly more likely that it would be added, than that it would be subtracted.——*Wine mingled with myrrh*:-Literally, *myrrhed wine*, that is, drugged wine, to produce heartening it might be, (see Bartholinus *de vino myrrhato*, in his *De Cruce*, p. 136), or to induce comparative anæsthesis or insensibility. Myrrh is a strong stimulant. The administration of drugged

24 And when they had crucified him, they [k] parted his garments, casting lots upon them, what every man should take.

[k] Ps. 22. 18. Luke 23. 34. John 19. 23.

---

wine to criminals, about to suffer, was a merciful custom, which relieved, to a small degree, the excessive ferocity so characteristic of the executions of those olden times. (See Buxtorf's *Lexicon Talmudic.* p. 2131, and Wetstein *in loc.*) ——*But he received it not*:—Or, as the reading is in the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts, and "the queen of the cursives" (33), *who however received it not*, (ὃς instead of ὅ). Our Lord did not wish to use any artificial means to mitigate, or otherwise modify, his sense of the sufferings connected with the culmination of his work. The value of these sufferings centred in the free activity that, first of all, chose their endurance, in consideration of the sublime moral ends to be subserved, and then self-sacrificingly held out, under their undiminished superincumbence, till all was finished.

VER. 24. *And when they had crucified him*:—That is, *affixed him to the cross.* This was generally done, it would appear, after the cross was erected. (See Lipsius *De Cruce*, ii, 7, and Salmasius *De Cruce*, pp. 333, 447, ff. ed. 1646.) Sometimes, however, it was done before the act of elevation. (See Lipsius, as above, and Gallonius *de Cruciatibus*, p. 8.) The evangelist, by means of his participial expression, draws a veil over the act of crucifixion, and hastens on with his narrative. In the Vatican manuscript, however, the reading is, *And they crucify him;* and Tischendorf and Tregelles have received it into their texts. Unadvisedly: for it would be difficult to conceive of any translator wilfully substituting the participial for the indicative expression, as there is an entire absence of literary art in here making use of a participial bridge. There is no attempt, by any kind of emphatic representation, to produce a sensational effect on the one hand, or to throw out the least particle of doctrinal hint on the other.——*They parted his garments*:—*They parted*, that is, *they distributed among themselves* (διαμερίζονται). It was a customary perquisite to the officiating executioners.——*Casting lots upon them*:—More literally, *casting a lot upon them.* The word for *lot* is sometimes used for *the thing allotted*, and is, with reference to *the Church*, translated *heritage* in 1 Pet. v, 3, from which passage it is that the words *clergy*, *clerk*, and *clerical*, have come into use. ——*What every man should take*:—A strange expression in the original,—the interblending, in an untranslatable way, of two distinct questions, (τίς τί ἄρῃ). The one might be resolved thus, *Who* (τίς) *should receive this, and who that?* The other might be represented thus, *What* (τί) *should each one receive?* The two questions were simultaneously answered by casting lots. But were lots cast in reference to all the garments, or in reference to the seamless tunic only? (See John xix, 23, 24). We may either suppose that the evangelist *masses* his expression in an artlessly free-and-easy manner. Or we may suppose that after the garments were sorted into two divisions—(1) the precious tunic by itself, and (2) the other parts of the dress by themselves,—there would be an arrangement of those other parts into four portions, as nearly equal in value as possible. Each soldier of the quaternion might then get his portion by *lot.* And after that, the seamless tunic, instead of being shared among them, would, by consent of all, be disposed of in particular by another casting of the lot.

25 And it was the [l] third hour, and they crucified [l] John 19. 14.
him.

26 And the superscription of his accusation was written

---

VER. 25. *And it was the third hour: and they crucified him*:-An artless and Semitic way of saying, *And it was the third hour when they crucified him.* There has been much discussion among expositors in reference to the horological expression *the third hour*, in its relation to John's notation of the time, when Pilate made a last attempt to move the Jews by saying, "Behold your king!" It was, says he, "about *the sixth hour*." (John xix, 14). Augustin discusses the matter at great length in his *Harmony of the Evangelists*, (Lib. iii, cap. xiii). But the solution which he proposes is far too ingenious. He supposes that Mark refers, not to the crucifixion as it was effected *by the hands of the Roman soldiers*, which would be about noon, or the *sixth hour* of the day, but to the crucifixion as it was *effected by the tongues of the Jews*, when first they began to cry out, *Crucify Him!* This, the real crucifixion, according to Augustin,—*the crucifixion proper, so far as their guilt was concerned*,—took place about three hours earlier than the final decision of the Procurator. "Produce," says Augustin, "a better reconciliation of the two representations, and I shall most readily acquiesce; for it is not my opinion that I love, but the truth of the Gospel." It would certainly be impossible to produce a more ingenious conciliation. The Pseudo-Jerome, in his *Breviary* on Psalm lxxvii, supposes that the word *three* in the existing copies of Mark's Gospel is an error of the transcribers for *six*. He supposes still further, that the error might be occasioned by the employment, in the earliest manuscripts, of numeral signs (Γ and the 'digamma' F) instead of numeral words. The Æthiopic version, it is worthy of note, reads *sixth hour*. And the same reading occurs in the margin of the Philoxenian-Syriac. In *The Acts of Pilate* the crucifixion is represented as taking place "in the sixth hour of the day." (Tischendorf's *Evan. Apocrypha*, B. ch. x, p. 284.) Cardinal Cajetan agrees with the Pseudo-Jerome, and thinks that *third* is a transcriber's error for *sixth*. But Patrizi, while having no doubt that one or other of the representations is a transcriber's error, supposes that the fault occurs, not in Mark's Gospel, but in John's. (*De Evangeliis*, vol. i, pp. 434–5.) If transcriber's fault there be, it is likely that Patrizi is right in attaching it to the text of John. (So Griesbach.) Mark's representation seems to harmonize at once with Matthew's (xxvii, 45), and with Luke's (xxiii, 44), and with the general requirements of the case. Compare Mark xv, 33. We must either apparently accept this alteration, or suppose, with Dr. Ward, that John's principle of horological computation was entirely different from Mark's. (*Dissertations*, p. 127.) The full discussion of the subject belongs to the *Exposition of John's Gospel*. (See Zeltner *De Horologio Johannis*.)

VER. 26. *And the superscription*: Or *inscription*, as almost all the modern translators render it. The word has no reference to the position of the placard as affixed above the head. The *super* has reference to the relation of the letters of the inscription to the whitened board, *on* which they were written. The word means *on-writing*, though it is always rendered *superscription* in our authorized English version. (See Matt. xxii, 20; Mark xii, 16;

over, THE KING OF THE JEWS.

27 [m]And with him they crucify two thieves; [m] Mat. 27. 38. the one on his right hand, and the other on his left.

---

Luke xx, 24; xxiii, 38.) Doubtless, however, the ticket would, as a matter of fact, be attached to that part of the perpendicular beam that surmounted the arms of the cross.——*Of his accusation*:–Literally, *of his cause*, that is, *of the cause of his condemnation to death*, or simply, according to the expression in Acts xiii, 28, and Luke xxiii, 22, *of the cause of his death*. The inscription announced the crime which had been laid to the charge of our Lord, and which the Roman governor had, against his inclination and his judgement, been, as it were, constrained to endorse as a sufficient *cause* of condemnation. It was a *demeritorious cause*.——*Was written over*:–That is, *ran as follows*. Had the expression been very literally rendered, the whole statement would have stood thus,—*And the superscription of the cause was superscribed*, or, *and the inscription of the cause was inscribed*, namely, as follows. It is an artless mode of speech, somewhat corresponding to the use of cognates in such a phrase as Matt. ii, 10, *they rejoiced a great joy*.——*The king of the Jews*:–That was the crime of which our Saviour had been guilty! The Procurator would intend that the inscription should have a sting in it for the chief priests and elders and scribes. He had been frustrated and galled; and he took his revenge by flashing the idea before the public mind, that it was a crime, in the estimation at least of the chief priests and scribes and elders, to seek to have a Jewish king. In the different Gospels there are minutiæ of variation in the representation of the contents of the inscription. These might, in part, arise from minute diversities of expression in the different languages employed. But, evidently, it was not the aim of the evangelical biographers to give the identical words, nothing more, nothing less, nothing else. It was only the substance of the meaning to which they had regard, and in which they felt interested.

Verses 27—32 correspond to Matt. xxvii, 38—44, and Luke xxiii, 32—43. Compare the cursory remark in John xix, 18.

Ver. 27. *And with him they crucify*:–Note the present tense. We, as it were, see the deed in process.—*(They) crucify*:–There is no nominative to the verb in the original. The agents are veiled. The whole expression is equivalent to the impersonal one, *and with him are crucified*. No doubt, however, the executioners would be the quaternion of soldiers, who had been detailed for the crucifixion of our Lord.——*Two thieves*:–Or rather, *robbers*. See Chap. xiv, 48. Possibly they were the accomplices of Barabbas; and if so, the Procurator might intentionally seek to show his displeasure, by precipitating their execution. He would thus let the people see in what light he regarded the man whom it had been their pleasure to honour. The names of the robbers are given in *the Acts of Pilate*, as Gestas and Dysmas! In the Old Latin manuscript c they are given as Zoathan and Chammatha!——*The one on his right hand, and the other on his left*:–Or, more literally, without the articles,—*one on his right side, and one on his left*. The expression is idiomatic in the original, and would not bear unidiomatic rendering,—*from his right parts and his left*. The position of our Lord between the two

28 And the scripture was fulfilled, which saith, [n] And he was numbered with the transgressors. [n] Isai. 53. 12. Luke 22. 37.

29 And [o] they that passed by railed on him, [o] Psa. 22. 7.

---

malefactors would not be fortuitous. He was treated as the most criminal of the three. Perhaps it was at the express desire of the Procurator, that the idea might stand out, in the boldest relief, before the public mind, *that for any one but Cæsar, to claim to be the King of the Jews, was the greatest of crimes.*

VER. 28. This entire verse is omitted by Tischendorf and Alford, and bracketed by Tregelles. It is wanting in the most ancient manuscripts at present known, the Sinaitic (ℵ), the Alexandrine (A), the Vatican (B), the Parisian (C), the Cambridge (D), as also in X, and in the Sahidic version. But, then, it is present in all the most ancient versions, the Old-Latin or Italic (with one exception, *k*), the Vulgate, the Peshito-Syriac, the Philoxenian-Syriac, the Coptic, the Gothic, the Armenian, the Æthiopic. It must, therefore, have been in the manuscripts from which these versions were made; and these manuscripts, or at all events the great majority of them, must have been older than the oldest now extant and known. The clause is also found in the excellent uncial manuscripts PS, as well as in the remainder of the uncials. It is found too in the best of the cursives, 1, 33, 69. It seems to be recognized by Origen. (See *Opera*, vol. i, p. 420, and note the plural word 'Gospels.') Tischendorf thinks that it was probably omitted by Eusebius. But in this he seems to be mistaken. (Compare the 'Canon' 8 in Luke xxii, 37.) It is far more difficult to account for an arbitrary insertion of the verse, more particularly when we take into account Mark's limited references to Old Testament predictions, than it is to admit the supposition of an accidental omission of the whole statement in some very early copy. The first word, as Griesbach reminds us, of both the preceding and succeeding verse is *and:* and this is also the first word of the 28th verse. Thus the eye of an early transcriber may have been inadvertently misled. It is difficult to suppose an intentional suppression of the verse. Compare Luke xxii, 37.———*And the Scripture was fulfilled which saith*: Namely in Isaiah liii, 12. It is a very striking passage, to which the Saviour had himself drawn attention in the passage of Luke referred to. His reference to it is one among many evidences of the Messianic nature of the Oracle.———*And he was numbered*: Or *reckoned* as the same word is rendered in Luke xxii, 37. It is, too, Tyndale's version in the passage before us, and is certainly to be preferred to Wycliffe's *gessidde* (i.e. *guessed*) and the Rheims *reputed*. Campbell has *ranked*. The word has, no doubt, in its primary import, a reference to *counting*, or *laying thing to thing*. But there is a fine connection between *counting* and *accounting*. There is *reckoning* in both cases.———*With the transgressors*:-Or more literally without the article, *with transgressors*. But *transgressors* is too feeble a version. The word means *lawless (ones),—those who set the laws at defiance*. Coverdale's version is *with evell doers;* the Anglo-Saxon, *mid unrihtwisum* (with the unrighteous); Wycliffe, Tyndale, and the Rheims, *with the wicked*.

VER. 29. *And they who passed by*:-The passers-by. Calvary would seem to have been by the side of one of the thoroughfares into the city. There

*p* wagging their heads, and saying, Ah, *q*thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest *it* in three days,
30 save thyself, and come down from the cross.
31 Likewise also the chief priests mocking said among themselves with the scribes, He saved others; himself he cannot save. 32 Let Christ the King of Israel descend now from

*p* 2 Ki. 19. 21.
*q* Chap. 14. 58. John 2. 19.

---

would be a continual flux and reflux of passers-by.———*Railed on him*:-Or, as the expression is rendered in Matt. xxvii, 39, *reviled him*. Literally, *blasphemed him.*———*Wagging their heads*:-Derisively and insultingly. Compare 2 Kings xix, 21; Job xvi, 4; Ps. xxii, 7; cix, 25; Lam. ii, 15.———*And saying, Ah!* An admirable and simple translation, (οὐά—'*vah*,' not *οὐαί*, as in Mill and D and E.) But admirable and simple as it is, it seems to have been reached with difficulty by our British translators. Wycliffe has *fie*; Coverdale, *fie upon the*, (for Luther had *fie to thee*); Tyndale, *Awretche*; the Geneva, *Hey*; the Rheims, *Vah*. The exclamation expresses here the bitterest irony and scorn.———*Thou who destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days*: Principal Campbell has a fine word for *destroyest,—demolishest*.

VER. 30. *Save thyself, and come down from the cross*:-Or, according to the reading of Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, supported by ℵBDLΔ and the Vulgate and Coptic versions, *Save thyself by descending from the cross*. But this reading seems less inartificial than the other, which is probably therefore the autographic. The substantive meaning of both expressions is identical.

VER. 31. *Likewise*:-That is, *in like ways*, or *in like manner*. It was not the common people alone and the casual passers-by who rudely and unfeelingly insulted.———*Also the chief priests*:-Forgetting the dignity that befitted their position and office.———*Mocking, said among themselves*:-Or, literally, *to one another*. But what they said *to* each other, they said *at* the surrounding people. They had come out of the city for the very purpose, apparently, of gloating over their victim.———*With the scribes*:-Who, notwithstanding the emollient tendencies of literature, were, in this matter, of one heart and mind with the chief priests.———*He saved others: himself he cannot save*:-*Is not his real impotence as regards others, notwithstanding all that has been said by him or for him, mirrored in his manifest impotence as regards himself?* Yet in uttering their taunt, they unconsciously stumbled on expressions which involved the highest truths. The crucified One *did save others*. It was not merely a profession: it was a historical fact. And for the very reason that he was engaged in still further equipping or qualifying himself for saving others, *he could not*—in consistency with his high and holy mediatorial aim—*save himself*. He must needs *sacrifice himself*. (See Luke xxiv, 26; Heb. ii, 10, 14.

VER. 32. *Let the Christ, the King of Israel, descend now from the cross*:-Ewald connects the nominative expression *the Christ* with the preceding clause,—*The Christ cannot save himself*. Lachmann took in the following designation also,—*The Christ, the King of Israel, cannot save himself*. No doubt, however, Robert Stephens did right in drawing the line where he did, by beginning here a new verse, and thus a new sentence. Jesus had confessed before the High Priest that he was *the Christ* (chap. xiv, 62) and before Pilate that he was *the King of*

the cross, [r]that we may see and believe. [s]And they that were crucified with him reviled him.

33 [t]And when the sixth hour was come, there was darkness over the whole land until the ninth hour.

34 And at the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice,

[r] Chap. 8. 11.
[s] Mat. 27. 44. Luke 23. 39.
[t] Mat. 27. 45. Luke 23. 44.

---

*Israel* (chap. xv, 2). His revilers try to work with the twofold confession as if it were a lever of overwhelming refutation,—*let him show, by coming down, the legitimacy of his claims!*———*That we may see and believe*:–They knew not that what they scoffingly urged would have left the atoning decease unaccomplished. They knew not, moreover, the sophistical ingenuity of their own spirits: for had the Saviour complied with their challenge, they would have been ready at once to attribute the prodigy to 'black art' and 'Beelzebul.' ———*Also they who had been crucified with him*:–His fellow-sufferers !——— *Reviled him*:–*Reproached him* for not delivering both himself and them. They had both, apparently, joined in flinging their barbed insults at our Saviour. But one of the two seems to have speedily discovered the irrationality and wanton wickedness of the assault. (See Luke xxiii, 39—43). Perhaps he was convicted by the very meekness and the unruffled self-control and self-abnegation that were manifested in the manner in which our Lord endured their insults.

VERSES 33—39 constitute a paragraph corresponding, as Eusebius long ago noted, to Matt. xxvii, 45—54, and Luke xxiii, 44—47.

VER. 33. *And when the sixth hour was come*:–The sixth hour from the dawn. It was thus near mid-day.———*There was darkness*:–It *became* (ἐγένετο) dark. And this although the sun was in the meridian of his strength.———*Over the whole land*:–A much better translation than that given in Luke xxiii, 44, to the same phrase, *over all the earth;* though the word rendered *land* in Mark, and *earth* in Luke, does not find its precise geographical or chorographical synonym in either of the translations.———*Until the ninth hour*: The darkness seems to have lasted from two to three hours. It was not occasioned by an eclipse, for the full moon cannot intervene between the earth and the sun. It was no doubt supernaturally contrived or overruled, as a fringe of the entire supernatural drapery of the great supernatural event which was transpiring within the Sufferer on the cross. Not that any universal laws were contravened or suspended. But a new force came in, which limited the scope and modified the direction of the other forces that were ordinarily at work. Or when we go to the ultimates of thought, and to the corresponding ultimates of objective reality, we may represent the case thus,—a peculiar volition took place in the divine mind, which modified the action, in that particular scene, of the omnipotent divine hand. It was meet that there should be around our Lord a penumbra of darkness. It at once reflected the mediatorial eclipse that was going on within, and cast a fitting shade over the guilty population in the immediate vicinity of the scene.

VER. 34. *And at the ninth hour*:–Just about the time of the evening sacrifice. The great antitypical sacrifice was about to culminate.———*Jesus cried with a loud voice*:–Very literally, *a great voice*,—the generic for the specific. The pang of the protracted sacrificial act elicited the cry.———*Saying, Eloi, Eloi*:–An

saying, [u]Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani? which is, being interpreted, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? 35 And some of them that stood by, when they heard *it*, said, Behold, he calleth Elias. 36 [v]And one ran and filled a spunge full of vinegar, and put *it* on a

[u] Psa. 22. 1.

[v] Mat. 27. 48. John 19. 29.

---

Aramaic way of saying *Eli, Eli* (Matt. xxvii, 46), and not unlikely the precise form in which the words were enunciated by our Lord. (See the Syriac version.) We must not think with Patrizi of a repetition of the exclamation, first in the one form and then in the other. It is probable that Matthew purposely quoted the original Hebrew of the Psalm. It was not, however, we may be assured, a matter of interest to the evangelists to record the particular dialectic pronunciation given to the words uttered by our Lord. The only matter of real interest in their estimation was the fact that he appropriated and uttered the initial words of the 22nd Psalm.——*Lama Sabachthani*:–The manuscripts BD and 1 read *lama·* the Vulgate *lamma;* ℵCLΔ, *lema*, and this reading has been received into the text of his 8th edition by Tischendorf; the Alexandrine manuscript and many others, read *lima*,—Tischendorf's former reading. Many others read *leima*. It is not unlikely that the autographic form might be *lema*.——*Which is*:–That is, *which means, which is in meaning.*——*Being interpreted*:–Or, *when translated*, for the *interpretation* referred to is simply what we now call *translation.*——*My God, my God*: The repetition denotes intensity and urgency of feeling. Wave, as it were, surges upon wave. The *my* indicates clinging and trust. The use of the word *God*, instead of *Father*, shows that it was in the human element of our Lord's complex personality that the darkness and agony had been experienced. To the human soul the Father was *God*—*the object of adoration.*——*Why hast thou forsaken me?*–Or, *Why forsookest thou me?* The Saviour was looking back to an experience, out of which he was now emerging. He had been *forsaken* or *left* by the Father; not, of course, physically or metaphysically, but politically or governmentally. In the sphere the divine moral government he was, as the world's Representative and Substitute, 'left' alone with the world's sin, 'bearing' it. See *Commentary on Matthew*, xxvii, 46.

Ver. 35. *And some of them who stood by*: For, notwithstanding the incubus of preternatural darkness, a proportion of the common people still hovered around, wishful to see the end. The very fact, indeed, of the darkness may have determined them to remain, if they belonged, as is likely, to the more superstitious class of the population.——*When they heard it, said, Behold, he calleth Elias*:–Or, Elijah. The exclamation took them by surprise; and, not catching the precise words, nor following to the end the sentence which was uttered, their excited and untutored imaginations, fixing on the first shrill cries, leaped suddenly to the conclusion that Elijah was called for. The sounds were sufficiently akin: and even the least religious of the people would probably know that some peculiar relationship of Elijah to the Messiah was predicted in the Scriptures (Mal. iv, 5). In their weird state of mind, it would scarcely have taken them by surprise, if Elijah had suddenly alighted, in his robe of rough skin, at the cross.

Ver. 36. *And one ran and filled a spongefull of vinegar, and put it on a reed*:–

reed, and [w]gave him to drink, saying, Let alone; let us see whether Elias will come to take him down.

[w] Psa. 69. 21.

37 And Jesus [x]cried with a loud voice, and gave up the ghost.

[x] Mat. 27. 50. Luke 23. 46. John 19. 30.

38 And the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom.

39 And when the centurion, which stood over against him, saw that he so cried out, and gave up the ghost,

---

Or, more literally, *round a reed*. The reed was, at its extremity, surrounded with it.——*And gave him to drink*: Holding the sponge persistently to our Saviour's mouth. The verb is in the imperfect tense. The man may have seen that the Saviour was apparently near his end, but may have hoped that, by the help of the refreshment, life might be protracted a little, so that Elijah, if he were coming, might have time to make his appearance.——*Saying, Let alone*:-An idiomatic expression,—*Let go! Stop!*——*Let us see whether Elias will come to take him down*:-More literally, *Let us see if Elias is coming to take him down*. And the man would look wistfully into the air as he spoke.

VER. 37. *And Jesus cried with a loud voice, and gave up the ghost*: Or, more literally, *But Jesus, having emitted a loud voice, expired*. He exclaimed, *Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit*. (Luke xxiii, 46.) The expression *gave up the ghost* is an archaism. The word *ghost*, the analogue of the German *Geist*, just means *spirit*. It is now, however, narrowed in its reference to actual or supposed apparitions of the disembodied human spirit. The biblical and theological phrase, *the Holy Ghost*, just means, *the Holy Spirit*.

VER. 38. *And the veil of the temple*: The curtain that separated the innermost recess from the anterior apartment of the sanctuary. It would be strong in its texture, as well as precious in its tissues.——*Was rent in twain*:-Literally, *into twain*, or, in more modern phrase, *into two*, that is *into two parts*.——*From top to bottom*: The rent was throughout. It was no doubt supernatural, indicating, by a sublime 'figure-of-fact,' as by a sublime 'figure-of-speech,' that in virtue of the decease, which had been accomplished, the way into the heavenly Holy-of-holies was now divinely opened up. See Heb. ix, 7, 8.

VER. 39. *And*:-Here follows another interesting and significant fact.——*When the centurion*:-The Roman officer who had charge of the quaternion of soldiers, who had been told off to see the execution consummated.——*Who stood over against him*: *Who stood near, opposite him*, or *facing him*.——*Saw that he so cried out, and expired*:-In the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts,—and hence in Tischendorf's 8th edition of the text,—the reference to the 'cry' is omitted. The expression runs simply thus, *Saw that he so expired*. It is not likely, however, that any transcriber would arbitrarily introduce the reference to the 'cry' as an object that was 'seen' by the centurion. It is more likely that some fastidious critic thought the expression awkward, and therefore curtailed the autographic statement. There is no need, however, for such fastidiousness in relation to artless composition. The meaning is obvious,—*The centurion perceived* or *observed the various complex phenomena of the decease*. He joined fact to fact, and connected them with the manifest peculiarity, dignity,

he said, Truly this man was the Son of God.

40 There were also women looking on afar off: among whom was Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James the less and of Joses, and Salome; 41 (who also, when he was in Galilee, [y]followed him, and ministered unto

[y] Luke 8. 2, 3.

---

and meekness of the wonderful Sufferer.——*He said, Truly this man was the Son of God*:-Too strong a translation. There is no definite article in the original before the word *Son*. Perceiving this, some critics have contended that the rendering should be, *a son of a god,—a hero*. They have maintained, moreover, that such a translation is most in accordance with what might be expected from the lips of a man who was a Roman and a heathen. But yet there is nothing corresponding to the indefinite article *a* in the original. The literal rendering of the expression excludes both articles and is perfect, *Truly this man was God's son*. It is left entirely indeterminate whether the centurion thought of other *sons of God*, or not. Note, however, the *was*. It was the centurion's notion that all was now over with our Lord.

VERSES 40, 41 constitute a little Ammonian section, corresponding, as Eusebius noted, to Matt. xxvii, 55, 56, and Luke xxiii, 49.

VER. 40. *There were also women*:-More literally, *And there were also women*, besides the other persons who have been referred to in the preceding verses. ——*Looking on afar off*:-Or, *Looking on from a distance*. Their attachment to the Saviour chained them to the spot; their modesty kept them in its outskirts.——*Among whom were both Mary Magdalene*:-Or, *Mary the Magdalene*, that is, *Mary of Magdala*. She was one of the most devoted of the Lord's disciples, and had experienced in her own person the marvellous effect of his mediatorial power and beneficence. (See chap. xvi, 9, and Luke viii, 2.) There seems to be no good reason for identifying her with Mary of Bethany, the sister of Martha; or for supposing that either she, or Mary of Bethany, was "the woman who was a sinner" (Luke vii, 37).——*And Mary the mother of James the less*:-Or rather, *of James the little*. (See chap. iii, 18.) He had been, it would appear, diminutive in stature, as were, doubtless, the ancestors of the considerable English families of *Littles* and *Smalls*.——*And of Joses*:-A common name among the Jews. See chap. vi, 3. The Joses here mentioned must have been well known in the original circle of disciples, seeing he is here particularized, along with his brother James-the-little, to differentiate the second Mary referred to. Wieseler would read *Joseph* instead of *Joses*, and understands the reference to be to *Joseph of Arimathea*. Unlikely.——*And Salome*:-The wife of Zebedee, and the mother of James and John, the 'duumvirate' who stood next among the apostles to Peter, the 'primate.' Was she the sister of the mother of our Lord? See John xix, 25.

VER. 41. *Who also*: The *also* is omitted in the Sinaitic (ℵ) and Vatican (B) manuscripts, and "the queen of the cursives" (33),—apparently in consequence of 'homœoteleuton' (αι και). See the manuscripts ACLΔ, which omit the *who*, and insert the *also*.——*When he was in Galilee*:-Or better, *While he was in Galilee*, for the *was* is in the imperfect tense, and its idea of continuance is reflected in the *while*.——*Followed him*:-*Were in the habit of following him* (ἠκολούθουν), namely, from place to place, as he went about

him:) and many other women which came up with him unto Jerusalem.

42 [a] And now when the even was come, because it was the preparation, that is, the day before the sabbath, 43 Joseph of Arimathæa, an honourable

[a] Mat. 27. 57. Luke 23. 50. John 19. 38.

---

doing good by word and work. Why? Partly no doubt because, unlike other Rabbis, he delighted to admit females to the full participation of the rights of pupils. Partly because of the wonderful spiritual attraction which he exerted. Partly perhaps for another reason: see next clause.———*And ministered unto him*:–They were *in the habit of ministering to him* (διηκόνουν). They knew that, notwithstanding the mysterious glories of his higher being, into which it baffled them to see far, he had, at those humbler points of his personality, in which he touched the conditions of ordinary mortals, numerous little wants to which they were capable of ministering, and by their attention to which they could leave him disembarrassed for his higher engagements. ———The first moiety of the verse attaches itself parenthetically to the last moiety of the preceding verse. The ladies specified were, so to speak, the regular attendants of our Lord. But many others, who could not get into the innermost circle, or whose circumstances did not permit their frequent absence from home, had yet been blessed by our Lord, and felt irresistibly attracted toward him. Hence they too lingered on in view of the cross.———*And many other women who came up with him to Jerusalem*:–To be present at the Passover, and to enjoy whatever manifestations of his royal nature and office it might please the great Master to make.

Verses 42—47 form a paragraph which, as was noted by Eusebius, has its correspondencies in all the other evangelists. See Matt. xxvii, 57—61; Luke xxiii, 50, 51; and John xix, 38—42.

Ver. 42. *And now when the even was come*:–The first of "the two evenings," or the space of time that extended from mid-afternoon to sunset.——— *Because it was the preparation*:–Literally, *since it was preparation*, that is, *since the day, whose evening had set in, was preparation-day*. The idea of the particular preparation referred to was in itself so definite, that the evangelist did not even need to say "*the* preparation." The *since* looks, reason-renderingly, forward to the action of Joseph, about to be narrated.———*That is, the day before the sabbath*:–Literally, *which is fore-sabbath*, that is, *which preparation* is *fore-sabbath*, or *sabbath-eve*. Compare the German *Sonnabend*. The reference therefore is generically to preparation for the Sabbath, as Sabbath, not specifically to preparation for the paschal Sabbath, as paschal Sabbath. (See John xviii, 28; xix, 31 and 42.) Every Sabbath needed "preparation," both outward and inward, if it was to be hallowed as a season of rest from the toils of other days.

Ver. 43. *Joseph of Arimathea*:–Literally, *Joseph, he from Arimathea*. So designated to distinguish him from other Josephs. The site of Arimathea is still undetermined. Many, inclusive of Grimm, suppose it probable that it was the Ramah, or Ramathaim-Zophim, of Mount Ephraim, where Samuel was born. But where that *Ramah*, or *Ramathaim*, or *Double-Height* was, is "one of the puzzles of biblical geography." "It is," says Dean Stanley,

counsellor, which also [a]waited for the kingdom of God, came, and went in boldly unto Pilate, and craved the body of Jesus. 44 And Pilate marvelled if he were already dead: and calling *unto him* the centurion, he asked him whether he had been any while dead. 45 And when he knew *it* of the centurion, he gave the body to Joseph.

[a] Lu. 2. 25, 38.

---

without exception, the most complicated and disputed problem of sacred topography," (*Sinai and Palestine*, p. 224). See Whitney's *Bible Geography*, p. 313.———*An honourable counsellor*:-*honourable*, viz., in a social position, as belonging to the higher classes of society. He was, as it were, a 'gentleman,' or a 'noble.' The same term is applied to ladies in Acts xiii, 50; xvii, 12. Joseph was a *councillor*, or *senator*, i. e., a member of the Sanhedrim.——— *Who also waited for the kingdom of God*:-Or, more literally, *Who also himself was waiting for the kingdom of God*. He had been a student of prophecy and of the signs of the times, and had come to the conclusion that the crisis of the ages was at hand. Notwithstanding his high position in society, and the consequent influences that were blowing in upon him in the direction of spiritual indifference, *he also himself*, as well as the humbler and avowed disciples of Jesus, looked for the speedy establishment of the Messianic kingdom.——— *Came*:-upon the scene.———*And went in boldly unto Pilate*:-He dared all the consequences that might be involved in the act, (τολμήσας).———*And craved the body of Jesus*: But not in a *craven* spirit. The verb just means, *asked*, and so it is generally rendered in the numerous passages in which it occurs. It is so rendered here in the Geneva and the Rheims. It is nowhere else translated *crave*. In the corresponding passages of Matthew xxvii, 58, and Luke xxiii, 52, it is translated *begged*. Tyndale has *begged* here too; Wycliffe and Coverdale have *axide* or *axed* (that is, *asked*).

VER. 44. *But Pilate wondered if he were already dead*:-It is the perfect tense that is employed,—*if he were already in a dead state*. As crucified persons generally belonged to a strong coarse class of people, it was no uncommon thing for them to linger on in life for more than a day. Pilate had seen with his eyes that Jesus did not belong to that class; but still he would feel surprised if he should be already deceased.———*And calling to him the centurion*:-who had charge of the execution. See verse 39.———*He asked him whether he had been any while dead*:-The verb here, unlike the preceding one, is in the aorist, *if he died*, and the adverb literally means *formerly*, or *some time ago*, (εἰ πάλαι ἀπέθανεν). It is rendered *long ago* in Matthew xi, 21, and *a great while ago* in Luke x, 13, and *of old* in Jude 4. The Vatican and Cambridge manuscripts read *now* (ἤδη) instead of *formerly*. And Lachmann and Tregelles have introduced this reading into their texts. Wrongly. Not only is the strong adverb of the *Received Text* overwhelmingly supported by the manuscripts, it harmonises, admirably though artlessly, with the tense of the verb employed. Pilate does not ask *if Jesus died just now*, but *if he died some time ago*, so that there might be no doubt that he was *now in a dead state*.

VER. 45. *And when he knew it of the centurion*:-As soon as he got knowledge of the fact from the centurion.———*He gave the body to Joseph*:-he *gifted* it (ἐδωρήσατο).———*The body*:-Literally, *the corpse* (πτῶμα).

46 [b] And he bought fine linen, and took him down, and wrapped him in the linen, and laid him in a sepulchre which was hewn out of a rock, and rolled a stone unto the door of the sepulchre.

[b] Mat. 27. 59. Luke 23. 53. John 19. 40.

47 And Mary Magdalene and Mary *the mother* of Joses beheld where he was laid.

---

VER. 46. *And he bought fine linen*: Such as was used for swathing the bodies of the dead. See Herod. ii. 86.———*And took him down, and wrapped him in the linen*: *wrapped* or *rolled*.———*And laid him*:–More literally, *deposited him*.———*In a sepulchre which was hewn out of a rock*:–*Sepulchre*, or *monument*. The Greek word (μνῆμα or μνημεῖον) means *monument*, for sepulchres that were hewn out of rocks, or rendered otherwise conspicuous, were intended to maintain the *memory* of the departed.———*And rolled a stone unto the door of the sepulchre*:–It would no doubt be a stone that was artificially fitted to the aperture.———*Unto*:–Literally, *upon*.———*The door*:–That is, *the entrance*. The word does not denote the mechanical contrivance by which passages may be closed. It denotes the passage itself, which was the *thoroughfare*, through which there was entrance-and-exit.

VER. 47. *And Mary the Magdalene, and Mary the mother of Joses beheld where he was laid*:–They *were beholding*.

## CHAPTER XVI.

*When Sabbath was past, some of the holy women hastened early to the sepulchre to anoint the Lord's body*, 1, 2. *They were concerned about the great stone*, 3. *But when they looked up, lo it was rolled aside*, 4. *Entering into the sepulchre, an angel addresses them, tells them that Jesus is risen, and bids them carry word to the disciples to meet their risen Lord in Galilee*, 5—7. *The women flee to fulfil this behest*, 8. *By and by Jesus appears to Mary of Magdala, who went and reported the fact to the disciples*, 9, 10; *but they did not believe her*, 11. *Then the Lord appeared to two of the disciples, as they walked into the country*, 12; *but even their testimony was not relied on*, 13. *Afterward he appeared to the eleven, and reproved them for their unbelief*, 14. *He gave them a commission to go and preach the Gospel to all mankind*, 15, 16; *and assured them that wonderful signs would follow*, 17, 18. *By and by the Lord ascended to glory*, 19, *and the apostles went forth and proclaimed far and wide the glad tidings*, 20.

AND [a]when the sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the [b]*mother* of James, and Salome, [c]had bought sweet spices, that they might come

[a] Mat. 28. 1. Luke 24. 1. John 20. 1.
[b] Ch. 15.40,47.
[c] Luke 23. 56.

## CHAPTER XVI.

A VEIL is drawn over the anguish of the following day. It was 'the day of rest'; but it would be, emphatically, to the disciples, a day of restlessness. It was the day of the expiry of the Old Dispensation. With the dawn of the first day of the new week, there came the dawn of a new era for the whole world of mankind. Our eyes are turned, by the evangelist, to the first streaks of the dayspring.

VERSES 1—8. Compare Matt. xxviii, 1—10; Luke xxiv, 1—10; John xx, 1—18.

VER. 1. *And when the sabbath was past*:—Or, *was passed through* (διαγενομένου). Wakefield totally misunderstood the phrase. He translated it, *on the Sabbath between.*———*Mary the Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James*:—She is called *the mother of Joses* in the preceding verse, and *the mother of James the little and of Joses* in chap. xv, 40. So artlessly does the evangelist compose, now touching on one differentiating relationship, and now on another.——— *And Salome*:—See chap. xv, 40.———*Had bought*: It is not a pluperfect in the original, but an aorist,—*bought*. So Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, the Geneva, and the Rheims; Luther too and Calvin. The pluperfect translation was a device of Tremellius, Beza, Grotius, and such other translators and expositors as Piscator, Petter, Erasmus Schmid, Wolf, Wells, Whitby, Schaff, to produce an artificial harmony with Luke xxiii, 56, "and they returned, *and prepared spices and ointments*, and rested the sabbath day, according to the commandment." There is, however, no contradiction or disharmony between the two narratives. And there is no occasion for resorting, with Greswell and Bloomfield, to the subtle expedient of supposing a reference to two distinct bands of women, a Salome band, and a Johanna band. Neither is there any occasion for supposing, with Doddridge, that the evangelist's statement is founded on a resolution of the women to purchase "a *larger* quantity of aromatic drugs." There is simply artlessness of representation, especially on the part of Mark. He had not in his mind the least intent to represent the purchase of the spices as chronologically subsequent to the Sabbath day. Neither on the other hand did he mean to intimate that it was chronologically anterior. He is not constructing at all a chronicle of chronological details. He was intent on only one great chronological event, the resurrection of our Lord—according to his own explicit predictions—on the third day after his decease. Hence the preliminary obtrusion of the expression,—*when the Sabbath was past*. But after having made that statement, he seems, so to speak, to pause and stand on tiptoe to get the earliest possible glimpse of the great event. And it is while thus in an attitude of expectancy, that he makes the statement regarding the women's purchase of the spices, without any intention of determining the date of the transaction.———*Sweet spices*:—Or simply *spices*, as the same word is rendered in Luke xxiii, 56; xxiv, 1; John xix, 40. It is also so ren-

and anoint him. 2 And very early in the morning the first *day* of the week, they came unto the sepulchre at the

---

dered here by Coverdale, and in the Rheims Wycliffe has simply *oynementis*, and Tyndale *odures*. But Purvey, in his revision of Wycliffe, has *swecte smellynge oynementis;* and in Lord Cromwell's Bible of 1539, Tyndale's simple *odures* is expanded into *swete odoures*. The word in the original is *aromas* (ἀρώματα), a term which, according to Max Müller, primarily denoted *field fruits* in general, and then came to be restricted to really *aromatic herbs*, on a principle corresponding to what is exemplified in the word *spices*, which originally meant unrestrictedly *species* or *species*. (*Lectures on Language*, Vol. i, p. 293, 6th ed.)———*That they might come*: The evangelist had the journey of the women in view, and hence this clause that might otherwise have seemed superfluous.———*And anoint him*: Namely with the liquid aromas. Instead of *anoint*, Bishop Hammond suggests *embalm;* and his word is accepted by Dr. Samuel Clarke, Whitby, Mace, Pr. Campbell, Dr. Adam Clarke, and others. It is, for several reasons, an excellent word, but it must not be supposed that there was a precise analogy, or closely-running parallel, between the Jewish and the Egyptian process. On this matter Harmer was quite mistaken. (*Observations*, vol. iii, 75.) The Jews did not disembowel, or use measures to prevent corruption. (See John xi, 39.) They merely showed their love and esteem by 'anointing to the burying.' (Mark xiv, 8.) They neutralized, for a limited season, some of the unpleasantnesses of death, and indicated the persistence of affection. They thus too subindicated the existence of a certain lively hope. The women, in the instance before us, wished to supplement the attentions of Joseph of Arimathea. (Chap. xv, 46.) Perhaps they were ignorant of what Nicodemus had done (John xix, 39). Or perhaps they simply desired to add their contribution to his.

VER. 2. *And very early in the morning*: Or simply *and very early*. The clause *in the morning* is superfluous, and is omitted in verse 9; as also in John xx, 1. Wycliffe omits it here, *ful eerli.*———*The first day of the week*:—Or '*on*' *the first day of the week*. It is a strange idiomatic expression in the original, *on the one of the Sabbaths*. It has occasioned perplexity to translators. Luther renders it puzzlingly, *on one of Sabbaths*. Coverdale, still more puzzlingly, *upon a daye of the Sabbathes*. The Rheims, *the first of the Sabboths;* Lord Cromwell's Bible (1539), *the first daye of the Sabbath*. Wycliffe is far superior in his version, —*in oon of woke dayes* (i. e. *in one of the week days*, i. e. *in No. one of the week days*). Tyndale apprehended the idiom precisely, *the nexte daye after the saboth day*. The Greeks sometimes pluralized the word *Sabbath*, in consequence of the Aramaic way of pronouncing the term, *sabbatha*. And the Hebrews sometimes counted the days of their week *from the Sabbath*, or *toward the Sabbath*. Or rather they, as it were, absorbed their week in the Sabbath, so that Monday was *one of the Sabbath*. (See Arias Montanus's *note in loc.*)———*They came to the sepulchre*:—Very literally, *they come upon the sepulchre*. The preposition denotes proximity. The evangelist is in haste, as it were, to see them 'on' the spot.———*At the rising of the sun*:—Not quite a correct rendering. The expression rather means, *after the sun had risen* (ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου). It was correctly rendered by Wycliffe, Purvey,

rising of the sun. 3 And they said among themselves, Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulchre? 4 And when they looked, they saw that the stone was rolled

---

Tyndale, and in the Rheims. Our English Authorized translators, along with the authors of the Geneva, were misled by Beza, who praised the reading (ἀνατέλλοντος) of his "very ancient manuscript," the Cambridge (D), though he did not introduce it into the text, or into his version. All the other uncial manuscripts are against the reading. It was obviously a tinkering to bring Mark's phraseology into closer harmony, as was supposed, with Matt. xxviii, 1; Luke xxiv, 1; and John xx, 1. The tinkering, however, is entirely unnecessary. There is no collision of representations,—although scope is left, amid their variations, for the reproductive faculty to adjust into unity, as best it can, diversities of details. (See an exceedingly ingenious attempt in this direction by E. Greswell in his 43rd *Dissertation* on *the Principles and Arrangement of an Harmony of the Gospels.*)

VER. 3. *And they said among themselves*: Or, more literally, *And they were saying to each other.* Namely, as they were approaching the spot.——*Who shall roll away for us the stone out of the door of the sepulchre?*–The magnitude of the stone, and the way perhaps in which it had been jammed in, occasioned them concern,—though they might be hoping to procure assistance from such casual labourers as would be stirring out to their work. It is noteworthy that they make no reference to the Roman soldiers. The likelihood is that they knew nothing at all of their appointment. The military guard was an afterthought with the priests and Pharisees, and had been obtained, not on the preparation day, but on the Sabbath. See Matt. xxvii, 62—66.

VER. 4. *And when they looked*:–More literally, *And when they looked up*, or simply, *and looking up.* The *up* is found in the renderings of the word in chap. vi, 41; vii, 34; viii, 24, 25. The sepulchre had been, as was common with such tombs, on the face of a sloping eminence of rock.——*They saw*:–Literally, *they see.*——*That the stone has been rolled away*:–In the Sinaitic and Vatican Manuscripts, and in the texts of Tischendorf and Tregelles, the verb is *rolled up* or *rolled back*, (ἀνακεκύλισται). It is likely to be the autographic reading, and modified to that of Matthew and Luke by the early Harmonists.–——*For it was very great*:–A clause that comes as artlessly in at the end here, etiologically, as the first clause of the first verse comes in chronologically. A less inartificial writer would have put the clause at the conclusion of the 3rd verse; whither indeed the writer of the Cambridge manuscript (D) has actually transferred it. So too Eusebius, in his quotation of the passage in his *Demonstratio*, x, 493. Wassenbergh thinks that the clause must have been anciently torn off from its natural position, (*De Trajectionibus N. T.* p. 34) –a most unlikely occurrence. Yet Dr. Adam Clarke took the same view; and Mace, Wakefield, Principal Campbell, Rodolphus Dickinson, actually make the transposition in their respective versions; while Wolle throws the preceding part of the verse into a parenthesis, (*De Parenthesi Sacra*, p. 38.) He was preceded in this device by Hammond and Petter, and has been followed by Worsley, Newcome, and Edgar Taylor. There is

away: for it was very great. 5 And entering into the sepulchre, they saw a young man sitting on the right side, clothed in a long [d] white garment; and they were affrighted. 6 And he saith unto them, [e] Be not affrighted: Ye seek Jesus of Nazareth, which was crucified: he is risen; he is not here: behold the place where they laid

[d] Mat. 28. 3.

[e] Mat. 28. 5.

---

no need for such surgical manipulation. Neither need we, with Meyer and Alford, imagine that the great size of the stone is particularized as a reason why they could not escape taking notice of the fact that it was rolled aside. It is enough, as Bleek judiciously decides, that the evangelist's phraseology is artless.

VER. 5. *And entering into the sepulchre*:—Or rather, *and when they entered into the sepulchre.* It is not implied that they entered immediately, or hasted as it were. The clause is not so much successive to what goes before, as preliminary to what comes after. It would be with trembling, and awe, and hesitation, that they would enter; and perhaps too after Mary of Magdala had sped off to inform the apostles. See Matt. xxviii, 5, and John xx, 1, 2.——*They saw a young man*: Or simply, *a youth.* Wycliffe has *a yong oon* (a young one); and Purvey, *a yonglyng.* This last is Luther's precise word (*Jüngling*). It is assumed that the bloom and beauty of youth are never effaced from angelic natures.——*Sitting on the right side*: As they entered, apparently. He might be sitting on one of the ledges or platforms, which are common in the oriental sepulchres, and which are convenient for the accommodation of the body during the process of anointing.——*Clothed in a long white garment*:—*Arrayed in a white robe.* The idea of *long* is only implied. *Stole* is the word used. Wycliffe's version is *hilid* (=*heeled*, i. e. *covered*) *with a whit stoole.*——*And they were affrighted* (ἐξεθαμβήθησαν): The idea of *amazement* is more prominent than that of *fright.* See the only other passages—with the exception of next verse—in which the word occurs in the New Testament, Mark ix, 15; xiv, 33. *They would be frightened.* But they were in particular *amazed* to see the empty tomb. They could not yet realize the possibility of the resurrection. This idea of *amazement* has something to do with the conciliation of the different evangelical narratives. Each evangelist depicted the resurrection-scene from his own peculiar standpoint; and, out of the multitudinous details of visits and revisits, crossings and recrossings, groupings and regroupings, he selected what sufficed to fill up his particular cartoon of representation.

VER. 6. *But he saith to them, Be not affrighted*:—*Be not amazed.* Nothing else has happened than what you should have expected.——*Ye seek*:—That is, *Ye are seeking I am aware.*——*Jesus of Nazareth who was crucified: he is risen: he is not here*:—You should not be looking for him here. You should not have expected, after what he himself said, to find him here.——*Lo the place where they laid him*:—The cerements were there, but the body was gone. Whither? Had it been stolen and hidden? Who would have been the thieves? Friends or foes? Not friends,—for how could their faith be made heroic, for their crusade against the world's unbelief, by a theft and a carcase? Not foes,—for it was their interest to prevent the disappearance of

him. 7 But go your way, tell his disciples and Peter that he [f]goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye [f] Mat. 28. 7. Mark 14. 28. see him, as he said unto you. 8 And they went out quickly, and fled from the sepulchre; for they trembled and were amazed: neither said they any thing to any *man*; for they were afraid.

---

the body, that there might be ocular demonstration of the falsity of the predicted resurrection. The fact of the actual resurrection of our Lord is a rock-of-ages that never can be moved. See *Commentary on Matthew* xxviii.

VER. 7. *But*:–Now that you see that your Lord is not here, but risen.———*Go your way; tell his disciples and Peter*:–Peter in particular,—because he in particular had denied his discipleship, and thus put himself as it were outside the circle.———*That*:–This demonstrative conjunction is here used *recitatively*, and thus introduces, in the direct form, instead of the indirect, what was to be said to the disciples and Peter. It is idiomatic in English to omit it altogether.———*He goeth before you into Galilee: There shall ye see him, as he said to you*: See chap. xiv, 28. The appearance of our risen Lord in Galilee, where he was best known, and where he had the greatest number of followers who were intimately acquainted with his person, and therefore best qualified to judge of its identity, was the most important of all the appearances. It was *the great public appearance*, and is no doubt that which is referred to by Paul, when he says, *After that, he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once; of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep.* (1 Cor. xv, 6.)

VER. 8. *And they went out quickly, and fled from the sepulchre*:–That they might fly, if possible, as upon the wings of the wind, to fulfil the behest committed to them. The word *quickly* however, though in the Erasmian or Received text, must have been a marginal annotation. It is wanting in almost all the good manuscripts, and in all the ancient versions.———*For they trembled and were amazed*:–Literally, *for trembling and ecstasy had hold of them.* The word *ecstasy* is the evangelist's own word. It is rendered *trance* in Acts x, 10; xi, 5; xxii, 17. They were in the highest state of mental exaltation, as if their spirits could not be contained in their bodies. The *trembling* that accompanied this condition of ecstacy was not properly *fright*, but *agitation.*———*Neither said they anything to any man*:–Namely, by the way. So Cardinal Cajetan and Grotius. It is entirely gratuitous to suppose, with Meyer, followed by Alford, that the meaning is, that they left their message unfulfilled. Such a conception of the case is intrinsically most improbable.———*For they were afraid*:–Why? Certainly not, as Petter supposes, "from the apprehension of some hurt or danger which might befall them by or upon the apparition of the angel to them." Neither is it natural to think of any far-seeing solicitude lest the news should get wind, and reach the ears of the members of the Sanhedrim, so as to arouse to persecution. Dr. Edward Wells comes nearer nature,—"*For*," says he, "*they were afraid to stay, and not to hasten all they could to the apostles.*" They were in a tumult of commotion, and could not pause by the way to speak to any.

VERSES 9—20 have become a battle field of textual criticism.

They are wanting altogether in the two most ancient manuscripts yet discovered,—the Sinaitic (ℵ) in St. Petersburg, and the Vatican (B) in Rome:—rather a remarkable fact.

Eusebius, the illustrious Bishop of Cæsarea, who died A.D. 340, and who was one of the most learned and inquisitive of the Greek Fathers, says that the Paragraph was wanting "in almost all the existent copies of the Gospel,"—"the accurate ones at all events," (*σχεδὸν ἐν ἅπασι τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις.—τὰ γοῦν ἀκριβῆ τῶν ἀντιγράφων κ.τ.λ.*). He adds, less sweepingly, that it was found "rarely;—in some copies, but not in all." (*Opera*, A. Migne's *ed.* vol. iv. p. 938.) These assertions, more especially when taken in connection with the evidence of the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts, are certainly startling.

Then Jerome, who died in A.D. 420, and who was the most learned and critical of the Latin Fathers, echoes the substance of the assertions of Eusebius,—but just as if he were making his own original observations. This he does in a long letter addressed to Hedibia, a pious lady residing in Gaul. He says that the Paragraph in question is found "in few Gospels, and is wanting in almost all the Greek copies," (*in raris fertur Evangeliis, omnibus Græciæ libris pene hoc capitulum in fine non habentibus.*—Epist. cxx, *c.* 3.) This language, like the first sweeping remarks of Eusebius, is exceedingly, and indeed almost sensationally strong.

But still farther, Victor of Antioch, who flourished, as is generally supposed, about the time of Jerome, and who compiled—chiefly from the writings of the preceding Greek Fathers—a *Commentary on the Gospel according to Mark*, still extant, re-echoes, though in a somewhat mitigated form, the strong assertion of Eusebius. He says that "in most copies the passage, *Now when Jesus was risen early, &c.*, is not found in the present Gospel." (*Commentary*, as contained in *Cramer's Catena*, vol. i, p. 447.)

Then there is an old Greek *Homily on the Resurrection*, which has gone a-begging for an author among the Greek Fathers, in which the substance of Eusebius's sweeping remark is strongly re-re-echoed. The passage runs thus,—"In the more accurate copies, the Gospel according to Mark has its end at "'*for they were afraid.*' But in some copies this also is added, '*Now when he* "*was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene,* "*out of whom he had cast seven devils.*'" This Homily has been ascribed by some to Gregory of Nyssa, and is printed among his works. It is often referred to as his. But, by Montfaucon and Cramer, it is ascribed to Severus of Antioch, and printed by them as his; while Combefisius and Gallandius ascribe it to Hesychius of Jerusalem, and print it as his. Hesychius flourished in the 6th century, and it is most probable, it seems, that he is the real author of the Discourse. (See Burgon's *Last Twelve Verses of Mark*, chap. v.)

Euthymius Zigabenus, who flourished in the 12th century, does not deal in such energetic phraseology as some of his predecessors. But he says, in his Annotation on the 8th verse, "Some of the expositors affirm that the Gospel according to Mark terminates here, and that what follows was afterwards added. It is necessary, however," he adds, "to interpret it, as it is not incon-

sistent with the truth." This is mild enough, but lets us see the continuity of the tradition.

In modern times few will be prepared to admit that the Gospel could have been intentionally terminated with the 8th verse (ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ). "That ought," says Griesbach, "to seem incredible to all" (*Com. Crit.* p. 199). "It would be," says Michaelis, "a wonderful conclusion of a book" (*Einleitung*, p. 1060, ed. 4).

Michaelis was greatly perplexed about the Paragraph. It looked to him like a patch. And yet he could not shake himself entirely loose from the conviction that Mark was its author. He hence, with that inventiveness of genius for which he was distinguished, struck out the following vivid conjecture on the subject;—What if Mark may have issued two editions of his Gospel, one in Rome, and another in Alexandria? What if the Roman edition was originally incomplete, while the Alexandrine was completed? Might not the evangelist, in composing the Roman one, have got just to the close of the 8th verse of the 16th chapter, at the very point of time when Peter,—at whose dictation he was writing,—was crucified or imprisoned? Why not? And why may not that event have put an abrupt arrest on the evangelist's composition? Why may we not account, in this manner, for the "wonderful conclusion"? And why may we not further suppose that, when the evangelist subsequently published in Alexandria his second edition, he added, as best he could, out of his own penury, what was needed to complete the narrative? (*Einleitung*, pp. 1059, 1060, *ed.* 4.)

Henry Augustus Schott of Wittemberg, and subsequently of Jena, the distinguished translator and editor of the New Testament, had a conjecture, somewhat akin. He had been disposed for a time, no doubt under the influence of Griesbach's judgement, to surrender the authenticity of the paragraph. But he swung back into the current belief, in virtue of excogitating a conjecture which accounted, as he supposed, for all the phenomena, and thus cleared away his difficulties. He supposed that ere Mark had finished his Gospel, it had got into the hands of some one, "perhaps a friend or companion, to whom he had privately communicated it," and this individual,—the more shame to him!—surreptitiously published it. Hence the copies that were deficient in the paragraph. By and by, however, Mark, when he had leisure, gave the finishing touch to his work, and published it in its present completed form. Hence the manuscripts that had or have the paragraph. But as meanwhile the thread of composition had been snapped, and a considerable time had elapsed ere the work was resumed, the addition was not very homogeneously composed or attached. (*Authentia Marci* xvi, 9—20. 1813.) How long Schott continued satisfied with this conjecture we do not know. But he seems ultimately to have swung back again to the opinion which he held, while he was working hand in hand with Griesbach. See his note in the 4th edition of his New Testament (1739).

Griesbach, as we have been indicating, was against the authenticity of the paragraph, and had his own conjecture on the subject. It was by no means so vivid as that of Michaelis; and it was more sober than that of Schott. Yet it is striking enough: and it has had immeasurably greater influence, than either or both of the others, upon the subsequent course of biblical criticism. He

supposed that the evangelist's conclusion of his Gospel had by some accident perished, most probably from the original autograph, and that the present paragraph had been substituted in its place 'by somebody' *(a non nemine)*—perhaps the editor of the collected Gospels, in the 2nd century. *(Comment. Crit.* pp. 197, 202.) This conjecture of the great critic,—backed as it is by a skilfully adjusted array of the evidence, diplomatic and patristic, that was at his disposal,—was acquiesced in by Schulthess. And the combined reasonings of Schulthess and Griesbach convinced David Schulz, —Griesbach's critical successor,—that the paragraph, as we have it, is "spurious." *(Nov. Test.* 1827.)

Tischendorf, so justly illustrious as a textual critic, acquiesces in the decision of Schulz. "That these verses," he says, "were not written by Mark is proved by sufficient arguments." Many details in the phraseology, as he thinks, are at variance with Mark's style *(a Marci ratione abhorrent)*.

Tregelles, with all his reverence of spirit, is of the same opinion. (See his *New Test.* and his *Printed Text*, pp. 246—261.) He says, unhesitatingly, "the *book of Mark himself* extends no farther than chap. xvi, 8," but he holds that "the remaining 12 verses, by whomsoever written, have a full claim to be received as an authentic part of the second Gospel." *(Printed Text*, p. 258.) Dean Alford, ever faithful to his honest convictions, comes to a corresponding conclusion. "The legitimate inference is," he says, "that *the passage was placed as a completion of the Gospel soon after the apostolic period*,—the Gospel itself having been, for some reason unknown to us, left incomplete. The most probable supposition," he continues, "is, that *the last leaf of the original Gospel was torn away.*" (Greek Text, vol. i, p. 431, 5th ed.)

Andrews Norton, in his *Translation of the Gospels*, shows the strength of his convictions, by leaving off, in his text, with the 8th verse.

Archbishop Thomson, with the whole tide of his sympathies flowing in the direction of what is Christian, feels constrained to say, "it is probable that this section is from a different hand, and was annexed to the Gospel soon after the time of the Apostles." *(Gospel of Mark* in Smith's *Bib. Dict.)* Dr. Lightfoot, too, full of a corresponding spirit, says,—"If I might venture a "conjecture, I would say that both John viii, 1—11 and Mark xvi, 9—20 were "due to that knot of early disciples who gathered about S. John in Asia Minor, "and must have preserved more than one true tradition of the Lord's life and "of the earliest days of the church." *(Fresh Revision of the E. N. T.* p. 28.) These cautious and reverent statements contrast favourably with Fritzsche's opinionativeness. "Nothing in my opinion," says he, "is so certain *(tam certum est)*, as that this section is due to another author than Mark" *(Comm.* p. 752). But Meyer is almost, if not altogether, as unhesitating. He says, "The whole section of verses 9—20 is inauthentic,—not composed by Mark." Ewald prints the section in smaller type, and says that "without doubt it was the conclusion of some other Gospel, now lost, and was appended to Mark's by the last redacteur." *(Drei Erst. Evan.* p. 366.) Hitzig thinks that the author of the section was Luke. *(Johannes Marcus*, p. 187 ff.) Hennenberg, though not capable of adjudications that stand out so boldly in relief, was of opinion that the evidence, external and internal, decidedly "preponderates against the defenders of the authenticity of the section." *(Die Geschichte des Begräbnisses &c.*, p. 167.) Klostermann too surrenders, still more decisively, to the same

9 Now when *Jesus* was risen early the [g]first [g] Mark 8. 31.

opinion. (*Marcusevangelium*, p. 298, ff.) And, before him, Bertholdt, Rosenmüller, Credner, Neudecker. After him Volkmar, who thinks that the inauthenticity of the section is proved by tradition, fact, and phraseology. (*Marcus und die Synopsis*, p. 606.) Baumgarten-Crusius surrenders verses 9—18, but clings tenaciously to verses 19 and 20 as Mark's own conclusion. (*Comm.* vol. I, Part 2, p. 211.) Michelsen, again, only surrenders verses 9—14, and decides that "verses 15–20 are the authentic conclusion of the Gospel." He thinks that the whole paragraph, 9—20, had probably been, by some accident or other, nearly illegible in the autograph copy, and that hence it was left out altogether by some transcribers, while others contrived to make out verses 15—20, and then supplied verses 9—14 out of Luke and John, as best they could. (*Het Evangelie van Markus*, p. 29.) But Reville will have no half measures. He is positive that the "independence of the whole section, relatively to the rest of the Gospel, is one of the unassailable results of modern criticism." (*Études Critiques*, p. 330.) Scholten too speaks as if the matter were now conclusively settled against the evangelist. (*Het Oudste Evang.* p. 323.) And the last section of one of the latest and ablest books on the Gospel, Weiss's *Marcusevangelium und seine synoptischen Parallelen*, 1872, is entitled, "The inauthentic conclusion" (*Der unächte Schluss*).

All this looks serious. And yet we are not convinced. When we separate mere opinions, vivid conjectures and strong asseverations, from real evidence, we find extremely little to put into the scale against, and a very great deal to put into the counter scale in favour of, the authenticity of the paragraph.

As, however, it is from the peculiarity of the composition of the paragraph, that the external evidence against its authenticity has derived most of its weight, we shall, first of all, consider the passage critically and exegetically, that we may have before us the materials for giving a candid judgement regarding the *internal evidence*. Then, at the conclusion of our exposition, we shall briefly sift the *external evidence*, on which the oppugners of the authenticity insist, and lay it in the balance, along with the counter external evidence in favour of the integrity of the Gospel. (See *Note at end of verse* 20.)

Ver. 9. *Now*:—Or *But* (δέ). The particle is *continuative*, and *connective*, and slightly *oppositive* too. The evangelist does not follow out the line of things that runs through the preceding verses. He takes up a new line, and goes on with it. Why? No one can now tell. Every writer is subject to multitudes of interruptions, and to various influences objective and subjective, which give occasion to peculiarities in composition. Inartificial writers, in particular, who have no theory about the unities of composition, and no literary aim or literary ideal in view, are peculiarly liable to abrupt breaks, turnings, overlappings, and other inequalities or inconcinnities of style. It is doing them infinite injustice, to apply to their artless deliverances the rules of a nicely-adjusted and fully developed scheme of composition.——*When (Jesus)*:—Or, *when (he)*. The absence of the noun is evidence that it was no "other hand" that was engaged artificially in constructing a patch. Had there been deli-

*day* of the week, he appeared [h] first to Mary [h] John 20. 14.

---

berate intention to prepare some appropriate supplement to the evangelist's Memoirs, there would have been, we have a right to assume, care and art enough, to insert, at the commencement of the supplement, the name of the person referred to. It was different with the evangelist. His mind was without art. And he had been already intent, throughout the whole preceding context, in thinking of the risen Saviour. Hence he had, in his own artless way, already jotted down one group of events connected with the occurrence of the resurrection. (See verses 1—8.) And now, on another plane of representation,—for he had only the rudiments of what might be called *a literary style*,—he exhibits another group. It is still, however, '*Jesus*' who is uppermost in his thoughts; and hence the artless omission of the name. If we should suppose, with Ewald and Meyer, that it is a *fragment of another Gospel* that is here artificially stuck on, then the editor who deliberately made the addition might be reasonably expected to connect it by supplying the word *Jesus*. If there was so much art as to seek for a patch, we might expect that there would be so much more as to make the patch naturally adhesive.——*Was risen early the first day of the week*:—Put a comma after *risen*, says Theophylact, and so connect the expression *early the first day of the week* with what follows, *he appeared to Mary the Magdalene*. Euthymius gives the same advice, (*μετὰ τὸ εἰπεῖν ἀναστὰς, ὑπόστιξον*). Eusebius himself suggested it to his correspondent Marinus. (*Opera*, A. Migne's ed. vol. iv, p. 940.) Jerome repeats the suggestion in his letter to Hedibia, as if it were his own original device. And it is re-repeated in Victor of Antioch's Commentary, and in that *Homily on the Resurrection* which has gone a-begging for its author. Grotius, in modern times, deemed the same punctuation a matter of considerable moment. So did Mill (Prol. §§ 812–815). Bengel also was in favour of it; and Wakefield. *But for no good reason.* Eusebius and his followers supposed, that, provided the whole paragraph were not rejected as apocryphal, the comma would be indispensable to secure the harmony of Matthew and Mark. The question which Marinus submitted to the learned Father, and which elicited the reply that verses 12—20 are not found "in the best codices," was this,—*How is it that the Saviour appears, according to Matthew, to have risen 'late on Sabbath,' but, according to Mark, 'early on the first day of the week'?* If, says Eusebius, you hesitate to discard the paragraph as apocryphal, then put a comma after the words *when he was risen*, and there will be no longer any contradiction. But, in truth, there was no contradiction at any rate. Matthew, in the passage referred to (xxviii, 1), is not speaking at all of the time of our Lord's resurrection. And though he were, still it could not be that our Lord would voluntarily rise on the Jewish Sabbath; for it was *on the third day* that he was to re-rear the temple of his body. (John ii, 19; Matt. xii, 40; xxvii, 63.) It must therefore have been *early on Sunday morning*, "the first day of the week," that he arose. And Eusebius, instead of writing at random, either about the existent codices of Mark on the one hand, or about commas on the other, should have applied his powerful intellect to the correct observation of what Matthew was actually speaking about, and then to the correct interpretation of the phrase, *the end of the Sabbath*, or *late on the Sabbath*. (See *Commentary on*

Magdalene, [i] out of whom he had cast seven devils. [i] Luke 8. 2.

---

*Matthew*, xxviii, 1.) The great body of expositors have done right in *not* putting a comma after the word *risen*, and in regarding the chronometrical notation that follows as determining the time, not of our Lord's appearance to Mary, but of his resurrection. This is, says Cardinal Cajetan, the natural construction *(suavis constructio)* of the words. So le Fèvre, Luther, Beza, Castellio, Suicer (i, 311), Wolf, Rosenmuller, de Wette, Fritzsche, Ewald, Bisping, Lange, Volkmar, Weiss, &c.———*Early*:–Namely, *in the day*, so that the word is equivalent to *in the morning;* and thus is it rendered in chap. i, 35; xi, 20; xiii, 35; xv, 1. Some of the oppugners of the authenticity of the paragraph think that, if it had been Mark himself who was writing, he would have resumptively said *very early*, using the phrase that is employed in verse 2nd. But why should any writer, or why should Mark in particular, be tied down to repetition? And was there not besides a peculiar reason for the *very early* of verse 2nd, which is not applicable to verse 9th? Is it not probable that the evangelist's mind was thinking of the time of the departure of the women from their lodgings? Comp. Matt. xxviii, 1, and John xx, 1.———*The first day of the week*:–Literally, *the first (day) of sabbath.* See verse 2. The oppugners of the authenticity of the paragraph urge that if it had been the real Mark who was writing, he would not have said "*first of sabbath*" (πρώτῃ), but "*one of sabbath*" (μιᾷ), as in verse 2nd. But how can any be sure that he would not? '*First*' is more natural intrinsically than '*one*,' which is quite a Hebrew idiom. It is the idiom, indeed, that is used in Matt. xxviii, 1, Luke xxiv, 1, John xx, 1, 19, and in Acts xx, 7, and 1 Cor. xvi, 2. As the favourite Jewish idiom, it would seem to have got into use-and-wont in connection with the story of the resurrection. But still the phrase *one (day) of sabbath*, or *one (day) of the week*, as meaning *the first day after sabbath*, or *the first day toward sabbath*, is, in itself, a strange expression,—not readily intelligible. It is not remarkable, therefore, that the evangelist,—who had an eye to the benefit of Gentiles in the composition of his Gospel (chap. i, 5; vii, 2, 3),—should have turned the peculiar Hebrew idiom into harmony with Greek and Roman usage.—It is also sometimes urged that it is unaccountable that the word for *sabbath* or *week* should be plural (σαββάτων) in verse 2nd, and singular (σαββάτου) in verse 9th. But it is enough to reply that the two forms of the word were in almost equal currency among those who had occasion to Grecise the Hebrew or Aramaic term. And it is matter of fact that Mark, having occasion to use the word only twelve times in all, actually employs it in the plural form just six times (i, 21; ii, 23, 24; iii, 2, 4; xvi, 2), and hence just six times also in the singular form, (ii, 27 twice; ii, 28; vi, 2; xvi, 1, 9). In both forms it has, in all the passages, a *singular* meaning. ———*He appeared*:–Even to this word Schulthess, Volkmar, and Weiss object, because in the only other passage in which the verb occurs in Mark (xiv, 64), it has a subjective instead of an objective import. Must then a writer confine himself to only one possible application of a term? If a term is ambidextrous, must he, in his peculiar use of it, cut off one of its arms?——— *First to Mary the Magdalene*:–But, says Volkmar, *three women are mentioned in*

*verses 1st and 2nd.* True. But the evangelist, as we have seen, is not pursuing continuously the line of things which starts with verses 1st and 2nd. He has done with that line, and has taken up a new thread. Artlessly indeed and inartistically, but still not unnaturally. He was not intending to write a scientific History. He was not even attempting to compose a complete Biography. He is merely giving *very brief Memoirs*, and these simply in a way of aggregation,—adding jotting to jotting.———As regards the fact of our Lord's first appearance, it accords with John's narrative that he showed himself, first, not to any group of women with Mary the Magdalene among them, but to Mary by herself (xx, 13—18). To reconcile this representation with Matthew's (xxviii, 9), we must suppose,—what is perfectly natural —that there was a variety of runnings to and fro. We may conceive the case in some such way as the following,—without, however, imagining that it embodies the absolute historic truth: -When the group of women saw the open tomb and the angels, Mary may instantly, in a kind of ecstatic bewilderment, have turned on her heels to run and carry word of the fact to the apostles. By and by the other women would follow. Ere long Peter and John would come running, and then return. Mary for a little season was alone, near the sepulchre, and Jesus revealed himself to her. By and by the other women rejoined her, and Jesus appeared to them all, as they were on their way to the apostles. There would be in all their bosoms not only interest, strung to the highest pitch, but ecstacy, and trepidation, and an impossibility of resting anywhere longer than a few moments at a time. (See Greswell's *Forty-third Dissertation.)*———*Out of whom he had cast seven demons*:-Almost all the advocates of the apocryphal theory of the paragraph look upon this interjected clause as incontestable evidence that Mark could not be the writer. For why, ask they, should he reserve for this place such an interesting incident? Why not introduce it at the first mention of Mary the Magdalene, as Luke has done (viii, 2)? Its introduction here is "inept," says Fritzsche. But surely it is enough to reply, that, as a matter of fact, the incident is here introduced by some one or other. And if some one here introduced it, why might not Mark? If we shall suppose, according to the theory of Ewald, that the Paragraph was the conclusion of some other Gospel, now lost, then the author of that Gospel had introduced into the concluding Paragraph of his work the statement regarding Mary; and we have no right to suppose that he had made no previous reference to her. Why might not Mark do the same? If we shall, on the other hand, suppose, according to the theory entertained by the majority of the oppugners of the authenticity, that the Paragraph was expressly compiled for the conclusion of Mark, then the compiler, though knowing that Mary had been referred to in what goes before, adds here deliberately the statement objected to. But if the compiler could act thus, why might not Mark? The statement is by no means unnatural. Mary of Magdala had, in a pre-eminent degree, experienced the gracious interposition of the Saviour. She had got rid of 'seven demons.' She had been formerly, it seems, sadly afflicted in several distinct respects,—why not in 'seven'? She had been overbalanced in mind. She had been kept on edge in her bodily condition, as regards those more delicate elements, which have mysteriously intimate connection with the mind. But having been wonderfully healed, she

10 *And* she went and told them that had been with him,

---

clung devotedly to her Saviour. She "loved much." And not in vain. She was pre-eminently favoured on the resurrection-morning.—But objectors take minute exception, still farther, to the mode of the expression, *out of whom he had cast.* Literally, according to the Received Text, it is, '*from*' (ἀπο) *whom he had cast out;* and Mark, it is alleged, always uses, with the verb *cast-out* (ἐκβάλλω), another preposition (ἐκ), or what corresponds to that other (ἔξω). True, so far. In *the two other passages* in which Mark has occasion to connect the verb with a preposition meaning *out, outside*, or *from*, he uses the two prepositions referred to. In chap. vii, 26, we read, "*that he would cast out the demon 'out of' her daughter.*" In chap. xii. 8, we read, "*and cast him out 'outside' the vineyard.*" And here, according to the Received Text, we read, "'*from*' *whom he had cast out seven demons.*" What then? Must a writer, who has once, or perhaps even twice, used a particular phase of a phrase, go on using that phase for ever, without variation, even although the variation be legitimate and in harmony with general usage? Or, when a writer gives, for the first time, a slightly diversified turn to a phrase, which he has already employed in another phase, must the authenticity of his composition be, for that reason, subjected to suspicion? It is true, however, that Luke has the very preposition, here objected to, in his statement regarding Mary the Magdalene (viii, 2),—"'*from*' (ἀφ') *whom went out seven demons;*" and hence, it is argued, it is likely that the statement has been culled from Luke. "It is certain," says Fritzsche. That does not follow, however, even although the Received Text be accepted as indisputable; for it is quite conceivable that the coincidence might have been the result of *a certain set form of phrase* having got into common use among the early disciples when speaking of Mary's case. But there is, in reality, no minute coincidence of phraseology, that might be supposed to indicate the derivation of the expression before us from Luke. The reading of Lachmann (παφ' ἧς) is accepted by Tregelles, and is no doubt the genuine autographic reading. It is the reading of the manuscripts C*DL, and 33 "the queen of the cursives," and is a reading which we may be sure would never be arbitrarily substituted by any transcriber for the Received; whereas, in consequence of the historical coincidence of the two statements in the two Gospels, transcribers were under the greatest temptation to alter the more peculiar word of Mark into the more familiar one of Luke. The evidence thus increases that we are dealing with an entirely original writer, such as we may suppose Mark to have been: and there is no reason at all for feeling the slightest scruple on account of his peculiar preposition. It is in fact interestingly significant; for not only were the demons turned *outside*, as it were, they were driven away *from beside* their victim. Such is the import of the evangelist's word.

Ver. 10. *She* (ἐκείνη):—Fritzsche, Meyer, and Volkmar maintain that the demonstrative pronoun here employed is never used by the real Mark without some distinct emphasis, and that here no emphasis is intended. But there is emphasis,—*She, as distinguished from all the rest of the women, she* was the first herald of the resurrection.———*She went* (πορευθεῖσα):—Here too the objectors press in with their objections. It is a word, say Fritzsche, Meyer, Volkmar,

as they mourned and wept. 11 And they, when they had heard that he was alive, and had been seen of her, believed not.

---

and Weiss, which Mark has never used in the whole of his Gospel hitherto, and yet it occurs three times (see verses 12 and 15) in this paragraph. Is it not, they would conclude, suspicious? Must not the paragraph-writer be a Pseudo-Mark? Why should we think so? Take a corresponding case:—There are two words translated *repent* in the New Testament;—one μεταμέλομαι, the other μετανοέω. But the Apostle Paul uses the former only twice, namely in 2 Cor. vii, 8, and the latter only once, namely in 1 Cor. xii, 21. Must we therefore suspect the respective sections in which the words occur as having been written by another hand?——*And told*:–Or *reported*, or *carried-the-tidings*.——*To them who had been with him*: Even to this expression some of the objectors take exception. It is, says Meyer, a phrase "foreign to the Gospels." But it really is not, so far at least as its essence is concerned. Even to Mark it is not foreign, for we read in chapter iii, 14, "Jesus ordained twelve that *they should be with him*." We read again in chapter v, 18, that he who had been delivered from the Legion "prayed Jesus that *he might be with him*." The second of these passages makes it evident that the phrase is not, as Weiss will have it, "the prerogative of the twelve." It is elastic in its applicability, and is most appropriately employed in the case before us, seeing that the tidings would be of transcendent interest not only to the eleven (see *v.* 14), but also to a considerable number of others who had been the followers of our Lord in Galilee. Hence we read in Luke (xxiv, 9) that the women, who returned from the sepulchre, "told all these things unto the eleven, *and to all the rest*." And when the two brethren returned to Jerusalem from Emmaus, "they found the eleven gathered together, *and them that were with them*" (Luke xxiv, 33).——*As they mourned and wept*: Schulthess objects to these words too, as containing superfluous information, and as consequently a proof that the writer was not the true Mark. But even Fritzsche here interposes, and says that this is carrying objection too far, *(argutatus est.)* Volkmar, however, thinks that the phrase has been borrowed from Luke vi, 25, "Woe unto you that laugh now, *for ye shall mourn and weep*," as if the combination of terms was so peculiar that Luke must have originated it! There is really nothing to wonder at in the expression, and nothing to wonder at in the fact that those who had been the followers of Jesus were found by Mary "mourning and weeping."

VER. 11. *And they* (κἀκεῖνοι):–This too is objected to by Fritzsche, Meyer, and Volkmar, on the ground that no emphasis is intended. Volkmar says that Mark, unlike Luke, never uses the pronoun except to express "emphasis or opposition." But here opposition is expressed, which is a kind of emphasis, —*And they, on their part*, as opposed to their informant on her part. The real spirit and meaning of the composition is missed when this antithesis is unnoticed or ignored.——*When they heard that he was alive, and had been seen by her, believed not*:–Or more literally, *when they heard (that) he is living and was seen by her, believed not*:–The construction is thoroughly characteristic of Mark's artless manner. The *that* (ὅτι) is recitative, and what follows it is, up to a certain point, in the direct form of report, but thereafter slides into the indirect. The writer does not say on the one hand, *that he 'was' living and 'had been'*

12 After that he appeared in another form unto

---

*seen by 'her.'* Neither does he say on the other, *He 'is' living and 'was' seen by 'me.'* But he says interblendingly, "*He is living and was seen by her.*" Meyer, however, and Volkmar, and Weiss, take exception to the verb *was seen* (ἐθεάθη). It occurs again in verse 14. But it never occurs, it seems, in the preceding part of the Gospel, and is therefore to be suspected as a word that Mark would not use. On the same principle we might suspect Romans xv, 24, because the same verb occurs there, *whereas it is never found in any other part of the Apostle's writings.*—Then Schulthess objects that the word does not simply mean *was seen.* True: but some one here uses it in the sense which it actually bears;—and why not Mark? It suggests beautifully that Mary had not only got a casual glimpse of the risen Saviour. She had deliberately *looked on him,* and *contemplated* him.—The expression *believed not* (ἠπίστησαν) is also noted by Weiss and others as "strange to Mark." Why? Because, though it occurs again in verse 16, it does not occur in the preceding part of the Gospel. But what of that? Should it have occurred? Or, does mere non-occurrence, within a limited range, make a word 'strange' or 'foreign' to a writer? Besides, the cognate noun *unbelief* (ἀπιστία) does occur twice in Mark, namely in chapters vi, 6, ix, 24. And the verb occurs only twice in all Paul's Epistles (Rom. iii, 3, 2 Tim. ii, 13): and what then?———*Believed not*: The news seemed to be 'too good to be true.' They forgot their Lord's explicit predictions. They would be supposing that Mary's nervous nature had made her the victim, for the time being, of some hallucination or optical illusion.

VER. 12. *After that*:—Our translators have omitted the 'metabatic' conjunction (δέ),—*But after that,* or very literally, *But after these things* (μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα). Yet even this expression, simple as it is, renews the suspicions of those who suspect the authenticity of the paragraph. It is, says Meyer, "strange" or "foreign to Mark." Why so, we ask? Is it simply because he never happens to use it in the rest of his Gospel? That surely is nothing "strange." He never uses the word *law* (νόμος): are we therefore to suppose that that word too was "strange" or "foreign" to him? He uses the word *reward* (μισθός) only once, (in chapter ix, 41). Shall we therefore suspect the passage on the ground that the word, being nowhere else employed by the evangelist, should be regarded as "foreign" to his vocabulary! Volkmar couples with the expression before us, an expression that occurs in verse 19, '*after having spoken*' (μετὰ τὸ λαλῆσαι) and says of the two, that "they never occur in Mark." True;—but what then? Though the particular phrase '*after*' *having spoken,* never occurs in the preceding part of the Gospel, yet the phrase '*after*' *the delivering up of John* (i, 14) occurs, and so does the phrase '*after*' *my rising again* (xiv, 28). Must these two phrases be suspected too, because the evangelist nowhere else uses them?———*He appeared*:—Or *he was manifested,* as the same word is translated in 1 John i, 2; iii, 5, 8; iv, 9 (ἐφανερώθη). Or it might be rendered, with Luther, *he manifested himself.* The term is rendered "shewed himself" in John xxi, 14. Volkmar, however, takes exception to this word too. He says that it is "never used *of persons* by Mark." Never! And yet the truth of the matter is that in all the preceding part of the Gospel the word occurs only once (iv, 22); and, as it so happens, it is there used

[j] two of them, as they walked, and went into the country.

[j] Luke 24. 13.

13 [k] And they went and told *it* unto the residue:

[k] Luke 24. 33.

---

of *things*, "Nothing is hid, *which shall not be manifested.*" Is not such criticism hypercriticism?———*In another form*:–That is, *in a different form* (ἐν ἑτέρᾳ μορφῇ). There was not merely a numerical, but also a qualitative otherhood. Grotius supposed that the reference is to *a different dress*. Vossius too; and Heumann also, and Wakefield, Kuinol, Rodolphus Dickinson. Wakefield and Dickinson expressly render the expression, *in another dress*: and Heumann, though not thus rendering it in his version, reminds us that the Roman soldiers had got hold of our Lord's proper dress! He hence starts and debates the question, How did our Lord obtain this different suit? He did not see, apparently, that at least twenty other questions would require to be started and settled, before the one which he proposes could be intelligently debated. It would serve no purpose, but that of frivolity, to discuss the reciprocal limits of the subjective and the objective in the matter of the manifestation, and also the various ingredients of things that might enter into the determination of the "form." The evangelist leaves the matter indefinite; and so should we.———*Unto two of them*:–That is, to two of our Lord's followers; not necessarily apostles. Compare Luke xxiv, 13, 18.———*As they walked*:–That is, *as they were taking a walk*. So Count Zinzendorf, in the peculiar idiom of the Germans, *da spazieren gingen*.———*Going into the country*:–Very literally *going into country*, just as we say, reversely, *going into town*. Compare chap. xv, 21. We learn from Luke that the brethren were taking a walk to Emmaus, a place that has not yet had its site identified by modern geographers. "All is mere conjecture," says Whitney. (*Bible Geog.* sub voce.)

VER. 13. The twelfth verse is but a stepping-stone to this. *And they* (κἀκεῖνοι):–There is intentional emphasis on the pronoun,—*They too, as well as Mary*.———*Went off and reported the tidings to the rest*:–Of the Lord's followers, whether apostles or not. Compare Luke xxiv, 33.———*Neither believed they them*:–The original is stronger, *but not even them did they believe*. And yet it is said in Luke xxiv, 33, 34, that when they got into the midst of "the eleven and them that were with them," they were met with the exclamation, "the Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon." This apparent contrariety demolishes at a stroke the theory of Hitzig, who supposes that Luke is the author of Mark xvi, 9—20. It also completely overturns the theory of those who imagine that the section, though not composed by Luke, was, by the hand of some other one, culled out of Luke. But there is no real contradiction nevertheless, whatever may be said to the contrary by Schulthess, Fritzsche, Meyer, Alford, Weiss. The disciples of our Lord were in the midst of the inconsistencies of a tumultuating and transition-state of mind. All their hopes had been suddenly dashed. They had been utterly disappointed. And yet they could not bring themselves to believe that their late beloved Lord had been an impostor. *Had he not been uniformly and perfectly pure? Had he not been almost infinitely unselfish and noble? It could not be that he was a deceiver.* And yet the unchallengeable fact stared them in the face, that, instead of

neither believed they them.

---

throwing off his disguise and assuming his royal prerogatives, as they had anticipated, he had been seized, tried, condemned, and crucified like a slave! What could they make of the case? Mary the Magdalene and other women had told them that the sepulchre was found by them open, and illumined by the presence of angels. Peter and John had run to it, and found the report of the women true, in its main element at least. Then Mary had told them that the Lord actually appeared to her. She was a lady. She was truthful. They could not, for a moment, doubt her sincerity. But surely her imagination must have imposed on her! By and by, however, the Lord appeared to Peter also, and he reported the fact to his brethren. His testimony had weight; and they received it with raptures. (Luke xxiv, 34.) And yet after a little, and because of the very preciousness of their new-born hope, they begin to be inquisitive and critical in reference to its foundation. What if Peter himself had been overmastered by his imagination? What if, under the influence of his sanguine nature, and with that haste which has been all along his besetting failing, he had mistaken a mere subjective vision for an objective fact? Then perhaps the assembled brethren would question Peter, and cross-question him, going into the varied details of the appearance,—until, it may be, Peter's own faith began to waver. When once in the full flow of this doubting mood, they would be ready enough to set aside the testimony of the two comparatively humble brethren who had returned from the country. They would say, *No doubt the brethren are honest. But surely it cannot be true that he who actually, on the cross, gave up the ghost, and was then buried, is now literally alive again! How could such a thing be? Must not the brethren, and Peter himself, as well as Mary, be the dupes of their fond imaginations?* Such would naturally be the state of the disciples' minds for a considerable length of time,—the tide of thought and feeling surging and resurging in contrary directions. And hence the facile conciliation of Mark's statement with Luke's. There is certainly, as Heumann remarks, no contradiction. And yet the appearance of it is so obtrusive, when the narratives are looked at from certain narrow-pointed pinnacles of observation and interpretation, that it was wrong in Alexander to pass over the whole matter *sub silentio*, as if there were nothing that required a single word of explanation. Augustin's theory of conciliation is good so far. He supposes that the disciples were not all of one mind. Some were convinced; some were unconvinced. Luke, as he imagines, refers to the one party; Mark to the other. (*Consensus*, iii, 25.) It is too artificial. Theophylact's theory is, that the two brethren from the country reported the news not to the eleven, but to certain others. So, though more generically, Euthymius. Also too artificial. Masius's theory is that the two brethren mentioned by Mark were a different pair from those mentioned by Luke. Painfully strained and artificial. Lightfoot has a bright but illusory glimpse; and yet he took along with it elements of reality. He thinks that Peter was one of "the two," and that when he and Cleopas showed their faces in the meeting in Jerusalem, a flash of hope flew over the assembled brethren, so that they exclaimed "conjecturally," *The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon!* "And yet when he and Cleopas open the whole matter, they do not

14 [l] Afterward he appeared unto the eleven as they sat [1] at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen.

[l] Luke 24. 36. John 20. 19. 1 Cor. 15. 5.

[1] Or, *together.*

15 And he said unto them, [m] Go ye into all the

[m] Mat. 28. 19. John 20. 21.

---

yet believe even them." Calvin is judicious, —"they fell back into their former doubts." So is Bengel, "they believed; but immediately suspicion, and unbelief itself, recurred."

VER. 14. *Afterwards* (ὕστερον):—The Vulgate renders it, *last of all.* So Luther, and many others, as Whedon. But the word just means, very indefinitely, *subsequently.* As to the precise time, see John xx, 19. The word occurs often in Matthew, but nowhere else in Mark. Shall we therefore suspect it? It is not easy to do so consistently, as it occurs only once also in John (xiii, 36), and once also in the epistles. (Heb. xii, 11). But should we on that account suspect the passages in which it occurs?———*He appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat*:—Literally, *as they were reclining* (namely, at table). See chap. ii, 15; xiv, 3. The word here used, though different from that employed in ii, 15, and xiv, 3, also occurs, with the same reference, in chap. xiv, 18; and hence the objectors to the authenticity of the paragraph do not get scope for founding an objection on its occurrence here.———*And upbraided them with their unbelief*: Or more literally and pleasantly, *and upbraided their unbelief*, as if the reproof terminated on the act. Instead of *upbraided*, Wycliffe has *reprevyde* (i. e. *reproved*); the Rheims, *exprobrated.* Instead of *unbelief*, Mace, Campbell, Dickinson have, unhappily, *incredulity.* Wakefield's version is much better, *want of faith.*———*And hardness-of-heart*: The word is used comparatively, and has reference rather to the impenetrability of their understanding, than to the unimpressibility of their feelings. (Compare chap. vi, 52, and see Luke xxiv, 25.) But it was an impenetrability, nevertheless, which was traceable to moral causes. It merged in their culpable *want of faith.* See next clause.———*Because they did not believe them who had beheld him after he had been raised up*:—Their minds had been full of erroneous preconceptions regarding the Messiah's career, notwitstanding his own explicit predictions, and the numerous prophecies of the Old Testament Scriptures. (Compare Luke xxiv, 26, 27.)

VER. 15. *And he said to them*:—On some subsequent occasion. (Compare Matt. xxviii, 16—20.) The evangelist, not intending to write a regular history, strides on in his Memoirs to a conclusion, compressing and welding, as he proceeds, a multitude of chronological and other details.———*Go ye*: Or more accurately without the pronoun, *Go.* The Saviour realized that the few disciples whom he addressed were but the representatives of an innumerable multitude of associates and successors.———*Into all the world*:—The word *all* is in its emphatic form (ἅπαντα). *Go into the whole world:* see that no part be omitted.———*And preach the Gospel*:—The Saviour meant *the good news about himself.* Compare chap. i, 1. It was no self-conceit in him to think that the news concerning his connection with our race, and the work he achieved, the sufferings he endured, and the glory into which he has been exalted, is 'the

world, and preach the gospel to [n]every creature. [n] Rom. 10. 18. Col. 1. 23.
16 [o]He that believeth and is [p]baptized shall be saved; [o] John 3. 18.
John 3. 36. Acts 16. 31. Rom. 1. 16. [p] Mat. 28. 19. 1 Pet. 3. 21.

---

good news' for universal man. His self-consciousness radiated outward and upward into infinity.———*To every creature*: Literally, *to all the creation*, that is, *to all mankind*. Men, as being the masterpieces of creation, are, for the moment, brought so close to the mental eye as to shut out from view all other creatures. No wonder. *Man 'is' the cope-stone of terrestrial creation.* All else on the earth, present and palæontological, points up to him, and is culminated in him. Lightfoot and Hammond supposed that the expression referred to *the Gentiles*. But that is an unwarrantable contraction of its import.

Ver. 16. *He that believeth*:-Namely, the Gospel spoken of.—*Believeth*, that is, *receives it as true*. It is involved in the peculiar nature of the thing believed, that it is trusted in, whenever it is believed.———*And is baptized*:-Namely, with the Christian baptism, which we must assume to have been explained to the disciples, and which mirrored to the outward sense the baptizing influence of the Holy Spirit of God. (See *Commentary on Matthew*, iii, 6; xxviii, 19.) The words given by Mark, in the verses before us, must not be regarded as containing 'a full report' of all that was said by our Lord. Compare Matt. xxviii, 18—20; Luke xxiv, 46—49. The respective reports of the different evangelists are no doubt exceedingly condensed, and confined indeed to some prominent outlines. Mark, in giving his outlines, exhibits his wonted artlessness of style, and hence the position of this clause, *and is baptized*. He did not mean to put it on an equality with the preceding clause, as if they were like paired horses in a chariot, or to intimate that *baptism* is as essential to salvation as *believing*. See next clause. But as, in the ministrations of the apostles, baptism was to be administered to the believing, as a sublime symbol of the cleansing which they needed, and which God was seeking to impart, it is here formally but inartificially introduced under the shadow of the great essential condition of salvation. In its spiritual essence, indeed, baptism is as essential to salvation as believing. It is, if possible, more so: for it is God who baptizes, or Christ; whereas it is man who believes. But, in its outward form, baptism cannot be essential. What Christ said of his words, is as true of his works, inclusive of the ordinances of his church, "it is the spirit that quickeneth—the flesh profiteth nothing." (John vi, 63.) The evangelist's inartificial method of collocation may be illustrated by his representation in Chapter i, 2, 3, where, after saying, *as it is written in 'the prophet,'* he introduces a preliminary prediction of another prophet. This preliminary prediction is thrown in by the way, and the reader is left to his good sense to make the proper adjustment. It is on a similarly inartificial principle that Paul himself says, in Romans x, 9, "*If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus*, and shalt believe in thine heart that God "hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man "believeth unto righteousness, *and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.*" The Apostle cannot mean that oral confession is as much a condition of salvation as inward believing; for salvation is complete when inward believing is completed. (Romans iv, 5.) But as the inward moulds the out-

but ?he that believeth not shall be damned. 17 And these signs shall follow them that believe; In my

? Jo. 3. 18. 36 John 12. 48.

---

ward, and confession in one way or another is sure to follow 'believing in the heart,' the Apostle did not scruple, in his free and artless style, to introduce it side by side with faith.———*Shall be saved* :-Namely, from his sins. (See Matt. i. 21.) His sins are regarded as imperilling his weal. He is in imminent danger because of them,—in danger of "perishing" (John iii, 15, 16), or of suffering "death" in all its deadliness. (John viii, 24.) When he is "saved" he is—theologically speaking—"pardoned" and "justified." Sanctification follows. Glorification is the grand result.———*But he that believeth not* :-He who wilfully turns away from the Gospel, and thus refuses to let his mind be interpenetrated, and morally moulded, by that absolute truth which embodies the only true ideal of human life.———*Shall be damned* :-Or rather, so far at least as modern idiom is concerned, *shall be condemned*. Indeed the same word (*κατακρίνω*), though occurring in other eighteen passages of the New Testament, is in only one of these rendered *damn*, Rom. xiv, 23. In all of the rest without exception it is translated *condemn*. (See Matt. xii, 41, 42; xx, 18; xxvii, 3; Mark x, 33; xiv, 64; Luke xi, 31, 32; John viii, 10, 11; Rom. ii, 1; viii, 3, 34, &c.) And such is its real meaning. It is strictly a judicial term, and determines, by itself, nothing at all regarding the nature, degree, or extent of the penalty to be endured. It is right that this condemnation should be, if there be wilful refusal to leave off sinning, and to accept the only divine, and therefore the only possible, means of getting deliverance from the effects of sinning. If there be a divine moral government at all, there must be amenability to the Moral Governor. And yet preachers of the Gospel should take care not to saddle, even in imagination, the forthgoing of the Great Moral Governor's judgements with any little, narrow, artificial conceits, which they may have casually picked up in their childhood, and carried with them in their inward 'chamber of imagery' ever since.

VER. 17. *But these signs* :-*These*, such as are about to be enumerated. "Signs" do not exist for themselves. Neither are they things that are ultimately aimed at by other things. They aim at other things. And it is in these things beyond themselves that the reason of their being is realized. All signs exist to be remarked. But the degrees of their remarkability may be infinitely diversified. To many the most remarkable are the unwonted and the miraculous.———*Shall follow them that believe* : *Shall follow accompanyingly* (*παρακολουθήσει*). They shall thus follow not those merely who preach, but them who believe, and all who believe. We are not to suppose, however, that every individual believer was to make use of, or to have experience of, every possible sign. "There are diversities of administrations, but the same Lord: and there are diversities of operations; but it is the same God who worketh all in all." See 1 Cor. xii, 5 -30. Neither are we to suppose that there is in this and the next verse an exhaustive specification of the signs. There are many others, inclusive particularly of 'love' (1 Cor. xiii), and its thousand and one gracious effluences which have permanently consolidated themselves into beautiful lives and benevolent institutions. In the passage before us, however, prominence is given to the signs, which were peculiarly adapted to commend

name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; 18 they shall take up [r] serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall [s] lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover.

[r] Acts 28. 5.

[s] Acts 28. 8. Jas. 5. 14.

---

and authenticate the Gospel at the outset of its career.———*In my name shall they cast out devils*:-Some of the disciples would be exorcists.———*They shall speak with new tongues*: New to them, such as were spoken in ecstasy at Pentecost (Acts ii, 4—11), or uttered mystically in the church at Corinth (1 Cor. xii, 10, xiv, 2—40). Some of the disciples would have that gift. (See 1 Cor. xii, 30; xiv, 18.)

Ver. 18. *They shall take up serpents*:-With impunity, if they should be compelled, by their persecutors, to pass through such an ordeal, or if, like Paul in Malta (Acts xxviii, 3—5), they should be accidentally attacked. Some would have such a gift, without any mixture of legerdemain.———*And if they should drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them* (οὐ μὴ βλάψῃ, the right reading):-*No, it shall not hurt them.* (See *Clyde's Syntax*, §41, a.) The cup of poison was another ordeal, too often devised by persecutors. But, when drained by those who had received the particular gift referred to, it would be innocuous.———*They shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover*:-The objectors to the authenticity of Mark xvi, 9—20 cannot take exception to the word rendered *sick* (ἀρρώστους, *infirm*). It occurs only five times throughout the New Testament; and in three out of the five instances it is found in Mark. See Chap. vi, 5, 13. The last clause is rendered by Lange, *And they (themselves) shall find themselves well.* But such a result would be nothing wonderful at all, no 'gift,' no 'sign.' The reference evidently is to the sick,—*they shall have (themselves) well.* Some, but not all, of the Saviour's disciples would possess this *gift of healing.* (1 Cor. xii, 9, 28, 30.)———The enumeration of signs might have gone on to a much greater length. But it was unnecessary. Striking specimens had been particularized, *as specimens;* and we must mentally supply *et cetera.* The sum-total could not be easily ascertained or enumerated. All the true fruits of faith are its true signs or signals. They authenticate, by divine signature, the divinely-transforming energy, and hence the divine reality and glory, of faith's great Object. They have been continuously reproduced from the times of the apostles, down to the present day, but under phases that correspond to the progression of the ages, and the development of living Christianity in living humanity. The fact that this living Christianity is the most plastic moral power in the world, is itself the sign of signs. Modern European civilization, in all its finer and more moral elements, is a sign. The elevation of woman is a sign. The abolition of slavery and serfdom is a sign. Hospitals, orphanages, convalescent homes, alms-houses, infirmaries, are signs. Moral chastity in art is a sign. The spirit of fraternity, working its way, fitfully but diffusively, into all classes and castes of society, is a sign. The increase of the humanity of man, is a sign. The effort to connect nation with nation by ties of reciprocal beneficence is a sign. The loving labours, among the lapsed and the unfortunate, of a white-robed army of Christian ladies, is a sign. The persistent advances in politics of right as against might, is a sign. In a higher

19 So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was [t]received up into heaven, and [u]sat on the right hand of God.

20 And they went forth, and preached every

[t] Luke 24. 51. Acts 1. 9.
[u] Psa. 110. 1. 1 Pet. 3. 22. Rev. 3. 21.

---

plane of life's experiences, accommodated to a higher stage of development, and to an immensely widened sphere of operations, the early signs repeat themselves. The most villanous demons of society are still cast out in Christ's name. Converts speak in new tongues, and more musically and expressively than if they were employing the most felicitous idioms of foreign languages. And yet, in the matter of foreign languages, nothing in the world is so polyglott as Christianity and the Bible. Medical missions replace the ancient gift of healing, and are more extensively effectual. By and by Christianity will dry up all the fountains of disease. And meanwhile, in place of immunity, here or there, from the fangs of literal serpents, and the deadliness of hellebore draughts, there are hundreds of thousands of the youthful and inexperienced, who, by the power of Christianity in their hearts, are kept in security amid customs into which the old serpent has breathed his spirit of decoy, or taught his dupes to allure with the poisoned chalice of indulgence.

VER. 19. *So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven: The Lord therefore (on his part), after having spoken to them, was taken up into the heaven.* Lachmann and Tregelles read *the Lord 'Jesus.'* But the word *Jesus*, though occurring in important manuscripts, and in a majority of the ancient versions, is not sufficiently supported, and was more likely to be added than to be subtracted. The force of the little particle μέν may, in some measure, be represented by the phrase, *on his part.* It looks forward to the counterpart particle δέ in the next verse,—*and they (on their part).* When it is said *after having spoken to them*, there is no minute chronometry intended. Least of all does the evangelist mean, as Strauss would insinuate (*Leben Jesu f. d. d. Volk*, p. 614), that there was an immediate and direct ascent from the supper-room, which is referred to in verse 14. The evangelist has by this time left the supper-room far in the background of his thoughts, and was, as in so many other instances, massing his representation, leaving the details of chronometry unparticularized. When it is said that *the Lord was taken up into the heaven*, we must not ask for a scientific conception of '*the heaven.*' 'Eye hath not seen;' neither hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive except in childlike symbol and hieroglyph.———*And sat on the right hand of God*:—It sounds like the language of spiritual insight and inspiration. Our Lord took his seat in the place of highest honour in the universe. The Father welcomed him. "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand." (Ps. cx, 1.) It is beautiful and sublime symbolism. The actual altitudes of the reality signified may be far beyond our present power of apprehension.

VER. 20. *And they (on their part) went forth*:—Namely, from their centre of operations, Jerusalem.———*And preached everywhere*:—According as doors were opened for their entrance. The evangelist, in this single expression, comprises and compresses the work and outgrowth of years.———*The Lord*

where, the [v] Lord working with *them*, and confirming the word with signs following. Amen.

[v] Acts 5. 12. Acts 14. 3. Heb. 2. 4.

*working with them* :-That is, *the Lord Jesus*, who had promised to be 'with' his disciples to the end of the world. (Matt. xxviii, 20.) He *worked with them*. There was a harmonious 'synergism,'—the Lord doing what man could not do, and leaving men to do what he had fitted and commissioned them to perform. In particular, the inspiration of the whole movement was from the Lord, and hence the outburst of signs that followed, and that are still evolved in ever fresh variety.———*And confirming the word* :-*The word preached*, the Gospel, which is, like its Lord, 'the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever,' —and yet ever varying in application, and infinitely full of varying applicability.———*With signs following* :-More literally, *through the accompanying signs*. But still more literally, *through the closely following signs* (ἐπακολουθούντων). The interval between faith and its wonderful divine effects is inappreciable. They follow close upon its heels, and hold out signals as they pass, which show that faith has gone on before, and is speeding away on its errand of mercy.———*Amen* :-This colophon has no doubt been added by transcribers. Robert Stephens inserts it, and hence Mill (or Mills). It is found in the manuscripts CEFKL, &c., and the supplemental D. But it is wanting in A, 1, 33, as also in the Clementine Vulgate, the Cureton-Syriac, the Peshito-Syriac, the Philoxenian-Syriac, and the Armenian version. It is not in the Elzevir : and it is omitted by Bengel, Wetstein, Griesbach, Lachmann, Scholz, Tischendorf, Tregelles.

To return to the subject of the authenticity of the whole section comprised in verses 9—20. (See pp. 467—470.)

I. As to *internal evidence*, there is, it should be on all hands conceded, a certain peculiarity in the style. There is, more particularly, a peculiarity in the way in which the connection of the section with the preceding context is effected. In the presence of these peculiarities, it is not to be wondered at that queries should be started.

But, *in the first place*, the entire artlessness of Mark, in the matter of literary composition, diminishes the first feeling of wonderment which arises on the consideration of the peculiarities referred to.

Then, *in the second place*, it seems to be quite inconceivable that the evangelist should have concluded his Gospel with verse 8th. Such a conclusion, —more especially when we bear in mind that the last word in the original is a mere conjunction,—would make the narrative go off like a knotless thread. It would be absurd. It would be unprecedented. What Cardinal Cajetan says in reference to the whole chapter,—under a mistaken impression of the meaning of Jerome,—is applicable, in a modified degree, to its first paragraph. No man, says he, in his senses *(mentis compos)* could suppose that the evangelist terminated his Gospel with the 15th chapter, for there would, in that case, have been no reference to the resurrection of our Lord, the very corner-stone of Christianity. Putting aside the mistake of the Cardinal, we may still take up the substance of his remarks, and say that if we should suppose that

the Gospel was concluded at xvi, 8, there would be far too little reference to the resurrection.

But, *in the third place*, it is unlikely that Mark's own conclusion of his Gospel should have been either, on the one hand, hopelessly illegible (see p. 470), or, on the other, entirely lost (see pp. 468, 469). Either of these suppositions is an extreme of conjecture that should never be entertained, except as the very last resort into which one may flee, previous to utter despair.

All this being the case, it is probable, to say the least of it, that verses 9–20 must have been Mark's own conclusion of his Gospel. All the intrinsic probabilities lead to this conclusion, even if we admit, as we do, that the inherent evidence from the composition may be legitimately allowed, in the circumstances, to count for little or nothing, either for or against.

II. As regards *external evidence*, it is certainly remarkable that the two oldest manuscripts extant, the Sinaitic and the Vatican, should be without the paragraph. But then these are actually *the only Greek manuscripts* yet discovered in which the section is wanting. It is present in ACDEFGHKLMS UVXΓΔΠ, 1, 33, 69, &c., &c. And the agreement of the Sinaitic and Vatican in the omission is not, perhaps, of such significance, if it be the case, as Tischendorf supposes (*Nov. Test. Vaticanum*, xxi), that the principal writer of the Sinaitic (viz., D) was also the penman of the Vatican. He transcribed, indeed, from different copies, when writing the two manuscripts. That is proved by the decided diversities in the readings of the manuscripts. But if he wrote the Sinaitic first, from a copy which was without the concluding section of Mark, then we may suppose that, if he found the section in the copy that was before him, when engaged in writing the Vatican, he might hesitate, in consequence of its absence from the other codex, whether or not he should engross it. But at length he decided, it would appear, either on the strength of his own judgement, or by the direction of some superior, under whom he was working, to omit the paragraph. This is not a mere conjecture, *growing up out of nothing*, like Michelsen's notion regarding the illegibility of the section, or Griesbach's surmise of the accidental loss of the leaf containing it from the evangelist's autograph. There is a peculiar fact in reference to the Vatican manuscript, which affords a basis of probability for the supposition. After the colophon "ACCORDING TO MARK," at the close of verse 8, "the remaining "greater portion of the column," says Dean Alford, "and the whole of the "next to the end of the page are left vacant. There is no other instance of this "in the whole N. T. portion of the manuscript, the next book in every other "instance beginning on the next column." (*Greek Test.*, vol. i, p. 430.) Tregelles mentions the same fact, and we ourselves witnessed it, when we were permitted in 1855 to inspect the manuscript. We may hence legitimately infer that in the copy that was before the writer, *the section was present*, although, for some subjective reason or other, he omitted it from his transcript. *We thus account for the vacant column.* And the concurrence, therefore, of the two manuscripts in the omission of the section is not of such significance, as, at the first blush of the subject, it might appear to be.

There are, however, it is right to admit, some little jots or tittles of diplomatic evidence that may be put side by side with the omission of the paragraph in the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts. The Old-Latin or Italic manuscript 'k,' called the 'codex Bobbiensis,' omits the paragraph. So do certain ancient manuscripts of the Armenian Version, in the Venetian library. So do two manuscripts of the Æthiopic Version; as also an Arabic Manuscript Version in the Vatican library, described by Scholz in his *Reise*. These are, however, mere diplomatic jots or tittles. They are evidence, indeed, that the section was sometimes omitted; but they weigh for little, when we come to strike a balance for the decisive critical result.

But is there no other adverse diplomatic evidence to be dealt with? Let us see:—

Griesbach, Scholz, Tischendorf, Tregelles (*Pr. Text*, p. 254), unite in asserting that the paragraph is marked by an asterisc in the two manuscripts '137,' '138.' It is apt to be inferred that the apposition of this asterisc was equivalent to some brand of suspicion.

But it turns out to be the case that in neither of the codices specified is there any asterisc. In the former (*fol.* 150 *b*) there is a cross, which was intended to refer to a note or scholion on the following leaf (*fol.* 151 *b*), to the effect *that Mark xvi, 9–20 is undoubtedly authentic.* In the latter, there is neither asterisc nor cross, but there is *the same note attesting the genuineness of the paragraph!* These witnesses have therefore, says Burgon, who has the merit of the discovery, "been by accident put into the wrong box." (*Last Twelve Verses of Mark*, pp. 117, 118.)

There are about thirty other cursive manuscripts, twenty-five of which are specified by Griesbach, which have, as is alleged, some note or scholion attached to the paragraph. The note is sometimes, as Griesbach admits, to the effect that the paragraph *is found* 'in many copies,' 'in very many copies,' 'in the accurate copies,' and in particular 'in the Palestinian Gospel;' while in other cases, he says,—though inaccurately,—it is to the effect that the paragraph *is absent* 'from some copies,' 'from very many,' 'from the more accurate,' 'from almost all of the Greek copies.' This statement of Griesbach is not only in some respects inaccurate, it does, even in the respect in which it is accurate, less than scanty justice to the scholia referred to, as it leaves the respective proportions of testimony for and against the paragraph in utter uncertainty. And hence the general effect of his remark, and of the accompanying array of manuscripts, has, as a matter of fact, been such, that succeeding textual critics have been led to assume that the evidence of all his five and twenty witnesses is, more or less, *against the authenticity of the paragraph.* Thus Tregelles says,—"A similar note, or a scholion stating the absence of the "following verses from *many*, from *most*, or from the *most correct* copies (often "from Victor or Severus) is found in twenty-five other cursive codices." (*Printed Text*, p. 254.) But this is a mistake. *It is not the case that there is such a note or scholion in the twenty-five codices referred to. And Griesbach does not say that there is.* (See his Nov. Test. in loc.)

Tischendorf, however, has fallen into the same mistake with Tregelles. He says, even in his 8th edition (p. 404), "The scholia of very many codices

"attest that the Gospel of Mark terminated with verse 8, in the more ancient, "and, as many add, in the more accurate copies." There are, he adds, about thirty of these. And then he calls on us to take note of three specimens of their number *(tres videramus)*. These three will therefore, we may presume, be picked witnesses,—containing the most obvious confirmation of the accuracy of his allegation.

Let us look, then, at the scholia contained in them :—

The first, '22', runs thus, "In some of the copies the evangelist closes here: but in many the text goes on as follows, *But when Jesus was risen early, &c.*" Note the word "some" as opposed to "many." This is not an attestation to the effect that the paragraph is wanting *in the 'more ancient' and 'more accurate' copies!*

The next witness is '1', in which the scholion runs as follows, "In some "of the copies the evangelist concludes here, and up to this point Eusebius "canonized; but in many the text proceeds as follows, *But when Jesus, &c.*" Note here too the words "some" and "many." This likewise is no attestation to the effect that the paragraph is wanting in the 'more ancient' and the 'more accurate' copies.

Tischendorf's third witness is '20,' in which the scholion runs as follows, "From this to the end is not found in some of the copies; *but in the ancient "copies the whole is found uncurtailed"* (*πάντα ἀπαράλειπτα κεῖται*). And is this evidence that, according to the scholia of the codices referred to, "the Gospel of Mark ends with the 8th verse *in the more ancient and the more accurate copies"?* The witness, in express terms, contradicts the allegation.

Not one of the three witnesses, adduced by the illustrious critic, confirms his assertion. The last of the three expressly contradicts it. To such an extent did the spell of Griesbach's array throw a 'glamour' over the eyes of one of the most perspicacious of his critical successors.

But not only is this the case. In not one of Griesbach's twenty-five codices, or any others that have since been added to them, is there any note or scholion to the effect that *in the more ancient or accurate copies is the Gospel of Mark terminated at the 8th verse*, or to the effect that *what follows the 8th verse is inauthentic.* Dr. Davidson, evidently relying on Tischendorf's authority (the 7th edition), says that "scholia belonging to the manuscripts 1, 15, 20, 22, 206, "209, 300, and others, say that the more ancient and accurate copies termi- "nated the Gospel with the 8th verse." *(Introduction*, vol. II, p. 112, ed. 1868.) *But this is, most emphatically, not the case.* We have seen the testimony of '1,' '20,' and '22,' as adduced by Tischendorf in his 8th edition. As to '300,' its scholion is identical with that of '20,' and is the precise opposite of what is alleged. As to '206' and '209,' the scholion is simply the following, "In some of the copies the evangelist here concludes, and up to this point "Eusebius canonized; but in others the text continues as follows, *But when "Jesus, &c.*" Nothing here about "the more ancient and accurate copies." As to '15,' its scholion is identical with that of '22,' one of Tischendorf's three, on which we have already remarked. All the witnesses, one after another, break down.

Scholz puts great reliance on '23,' '34,' '39,' and '41,' as having a note from Severus of Antioch, to the following effect,—"In the more accurate copies the

"Gospel according to Mark terminates with the words, '*for they were afraid;*' "but in some copies it is added, '*But when Jesus was risen, &c.*'" But in '23,' '34,' and '39' there is no such scholion; and in '41' there is a scholion to the opposite effect,—*that the accurate copies contain the contents of the last twelve verses.* In '34' and '29' there are large extracts, *at the conclusion of 'Matthew's Gospel*, from the Homily on the Resurrection, which has gone a-begging for its author, and in which Eusebius's remarks are re-re-echoed. (See Burgon's masterly sifting of all this class of evidence, in the 8th chapter of his *Last Twelve Verses of Mark.*)

When Griesbach said that the scholia of the codices, to which he referred, testified that the paragraph was wanting '*in some*,' '*in most*,' in '*almost all the Greek copies*,' *and in* '*the more accurate copies*,' he spoke under mental confusion, and had, as we presume, unconsciously mingled, in his mind, the strong, strange assertions of Eusebius, Jerome, and the author of the begging Homily, with the more sober statements of the codices.

The whole diplomatic evidence—with the exception of that of the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts—is breaking down. Only one other manuscript remains to be noticed, the uncial L, a codex in Paris of the 8th or 9th century. Tischendorf ascribes it to the 8th. At the close of verse 8, there occurs in a sort of frame-work of dashes, the following notice, "In some instances there is added as follows." Then we read:—"*But all the things enjoined they announced without delay to those who were around Peter. And afterward Jesus himself, from the east unto the west, sent forth through them the holy and incorruptible message of eternal salvation.*" Then there is another framed remark,—"But there is also the following continuation after the words *for they were afraid.*" Then follows the text as we have it. The manuscript is evidence that in some cases the concluding paragraph was not recognised as authentic. That is all.

To turn now to *the patristic evidence.* It runs up to Eusebius, as we have seen (p. 467), and resolves itself, to a large extent, into his admission "*that one, puzzled to reconcile the representations of Matthew and Mark regarding the time of our Lord's resurrection, might say* (εἴποι ἄν) *that the paragraph in Mark is not in all the copies;—and that the accurate copies finish with the words, 'for they were afraid':—there the end is put in almost all the copies of Mark's Gospel.*" (Opera, vol. iv, p. 937.)

Jerome in his Letter to Hedibia simply gives a free translation of Eusebius's admission; and indeed the query of Hedibia addressed to Jerome, is simply a translation of the query of Marinus addressed to Eusebius.

The begging Homily,—sometimes ascribed to Gregory of Nyssa, sometimes to Severus of Antioch, and sometimes to Hesychius of Jerusalem,—just re-echoes the salient admission, and implicated assertions, of Eusebius.

Victor of Antioch goes no farther, so far as *that passage* is concerned in which he says that "*in most copies the paragraph, 'Now when Jesus was risen early, &c.,' is not found in the present Gospel.*" (Cramer, Cat. 1. p. 447.)

As to Euthymius, he merely says that *some expositors affirm that the Gospel terminates with the words 'for they were afraid.'*

Such is the substance of the adverse patristic testimony. (*Omnia ex uno fonte promanarunt*, Matthæi, vol. ii, p. 270.) But there has been, in many cases, a strange tendency to exaggerate its amount and strength.

To begin with Euthymius, the last name in our list, Dean Alford represents him as, along with Severus, Victor, Gregory of Nyssa (or Hesychius of Jerusalem), and Jerome, "saying that the paragraph is wanting in the *greater number*, or in the *more accurate*" copies. But this is altogether contrary to fact. Euthymius says nothing of the kind. Neither does he, as Volkmar alleges, "condemn" the paragraph, "as spurious." (*Marcusevangelium*, p. 607.) He only says that '*some* expositors' affirm that the Gospel terminates with the words "for they were afraid."

Dean Alford,—it will have been, still further, noticed,—represents Severus *and* Gregory of Nyssa (or Hesychius of Jerusalem) as uniting with Euthymius &c. in testifying that the paragraph is "wanting in the greater number or in the more accurate copies." A corresponding representation is made by Volkmar, Davidson, and Tregelles too. Tregelles says,—"This testimony (of Severus) *may* be but a repetition of that already cited from Gregory of Nyssa: but if so, it is, at least, an *approving* quotation." (*Printed Text*, p. 249.) But it is nothing of the kind. Severus is not quoting, approvingly, from Gregory of Nyssa. The Homily in which the passage occurs is by some authorities ascribed to Gregory, by others to Severus, by others still to Hesychius. And its testimony therefore, such as it is, is the testimony of but one Father, not of two, or three. Of late the Homily has been generally ascribed to Hesychius. (See *Tischendorf*, p. 405.)

Again the testimony, such as it is, of both Hesychius, and Victor of Antioch (in the passage referred to), *is not an independent judgement*. Neither is it *an independent statement of facts regarding the codices of Mark's Gospel*. It is *the mere echo of a hearsay*, or the confiding and unreflective repetition of the admission and implications of Eusebius. It is a mere uncritical *take-on-trust*. It counts, therefore, for absolutely nothing as evidence.

Precisely of the same value is the testimony of Jerome, in his letter to Hedibia. It is mere unreflective repetition in Latin of the Greek of Eusebius; and there is real evidence to show that it must have been dashed off inconsiderately, when "good Homer was nodding." It certainly did not soberly represent the result of Jerome's own investigation or observation: for he expressly contradicts, in a subsequent writing, his own sweeping asseveration. In the letter to Hedibia, which was written about the year A.D. 406,—he says that her difficulty about the conciliation of Matthew and Mark, in their respective accounts of our Lord's resurrection, might be met thus:—*We may reject the testimony of Mark, which is contained in few Gospels, almost all the Greek copies being deficient in the last paragraph.* (Epist. cxx, c. 3.) But in his *Dialogue against the Pelagians*, which was written about the year A.D. 415, he says expressly, "In some copies, and *especially in the Greek codices* (et maxime in "Græcis codicibus) it is written at the end of the Gospel according to Mark, "*when afterward the eleven were reclining at table, Jesus appeared to them, and "reproved their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they listened not to those who "had seen him rising (resurgentem).*" See Lib. ii, § 15. The two representations

are not in harmony. (*Unde hæc tanta inconstantia et levitas, sancte Hieronyme?* —Matthæi, Animadversio in Marc. xvi, 9—20.) And, as in the former he is actually only echoing Eusebius, we may look upon the latter as representing his own observation, so far as he applied his mind independently to the subject. Jerome's testimony against the paragraph is thus doubly nullified, so far as real independent evidence is concerned.

The testimony too of Eusebius is of avail merely to the extent of affording evidence *that in some copies of the Gospel the concluding section was wanting.* What he says about "the accurate copies" must be set down to his rhetoric, shaping itself capriciously on the spur of the moment, and putting into the mouth of a puzzled person *what, in the way of a special plea, might be said.* So must his remark about "almost all the copies." For not only is there evidence, as we shall soon see, outside the testimony of Eusebius, to invalidate his representation; there is evidence, *inside his own remarks,* that he was speaking rashly and rhetorically, and neither as a critic, nor as a judge. For after saying that it might be alleged that "in *almost all the copies* of Mark's Gospel the end is put at the words *for they were afraid,*" he adds that it might be said that "what follows is superfluous, and is *rarely* met with in the codices, *in some, but not in all.*" Why this last modification of the case? Why, after saying that the paragraph is *rarely* (σπανίως) met with, does he add "in *some* copies, but *not in all*"? It is evident that he felt that he had in his first expressions overstated the case. But instead of going back, and obliterating what he had written, as he would have done had he been acting judicially, he contents himself with appending a modifying remark. And yet, be it noted, *this is his ultimate representation of the case,* so that we may take it as his real evidence, so far as he felt bound, in consistency with his special plea, to give it. *The paragraph was not found in 'all copies.'* That is all.

That we are doing no injustice to Eusebius in this matter is evinced by the following facts in counter-evidence:—

(1.) The paragraph *is* found in all the existing manuscripts of the Old-Latin version, or the *Itala*, with the exception of k, a late copy. It is also found in all the codices of the Vulgate, Jerome's revision of the Old-Latin. It is found, likewise, in all the Syriac versions, the Cureton (fragmentarily), the Peshito, the Philoxenian, and, as Adler expressly notes, in the Jerusalem Lectionary. (*Versiones Syr.*, p. 177.) It is found also in the Coptic version, and the Gothic (fragmentarily), and in the printed Armenian and Æthiopic versions. *In short it is found in all the ancient versions.* And as these, in their sum-total at least, represent manuscripts widely dispersed over the world, and *very much older than any now existing, much older too than the times of Eusebius,* we must come to the conclusion that he spoke rashly, and from only a limited range of observation and collation.

(2.) Again, in all the existing Greek and Syriac Lectionaries, or Evangeliaries and Synaxaries, so far as yet examined, the paragraph is found,—forming part of the public lections, lessons, or readings of Scripture, that have been in use, throughout the churches of Christendom, from time immemorial, and certainly from a time anterior to Eusebius. (See *Matthæi's Animadversio ad Marcum xvi, 9—20,* in vol. ii, of his N. T., 1st ed.; and his note in his 2d ed.,

vol. i., p. 748; and thence *Griesbach's* admission, *Nov. Test.*, vol. i, p. 291. See also Burgon's *Last Twelve Verses of Mark*, chap. x.)

(3.) Victor of Antioch, while in the body of his collections echoing emphatically the admission of Eusebius in reference to the paragraph, yet in the last words of his Commentary—as has been noted by Matthæi, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Bishop Wordsworth, &c.—leaves on record the result of his deliberate investigation. He says, "But although the words, *But when he was "risen early*, with what follows, are not found in very many copies of the pre- "sent Gospel, seeing some have deemed them inauthentic, yet we, *having "found them in very many copies, have added, out of accurate transcripts, and "according to the verity of the Palestinian Gospel* (καὶ κατὰ τὸ Παλαιστιναῖον "Εὐαγγέλιον, ὡς ἔχει ἡ ἀλήθεια Μάρκου), *the appended account of the resurrection "of our Lord, following upon the words 'for they were afraid:'* that is, we "have added from the words, *But when he was risen early*, to the words *through "the accompanying signs.*" (*Cramer's Catena*, vol. i, p. 447.) Thus Victor's name, by his own express desire, falls to be struck from the list of the supposed opponents of the section. And the evidence on which his name is struck off is evidence that directly invalidates the rash assertions of Eusebius. There was some important copy of the Gospel of Mark, that either had its resting-place in Palestine, or was in some other special way intimately associated with the Holy Land; and in this important codex, as well as in 'many other accurate copies,' examined either at first or at second hand, Victor found the disputed section.

(4.) Then Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, in the latter half of the 2nd century, and thus long anterior to Eusebius, quotes the 19th verse of the section, and quotes it expressly as Mark's. (Hæres, iii, 10, 6.) It will be admitted that the manuscript from which he transcribed must have been *a very ancient copy*. Hippolytus too, Bishop of Portus near Rome, at the end of the 2nd and the beginning of the 3rd century, quotes the 17th and 18th verses in his fragment *Concerning the Gifts of Grace*. The copy or copies from which he quoted must have been *exceedingly old*. Moreover James of Nisibis, or Aphraates the Persian sage, in the early part of the 4th century, and Ambrose later on in the same century, and then Augustin in the 5th, and Chrysostom between,—all these quote explicitly from the passage, and, of course, quote from texts that were at least as old as themselves. A quotation from the paragraph, moreover, seems to be made in the *Acts of Pilate*, which Tischendorf ascribes to the 3rd century. (See pp. 243, 356.) And it is not unlikely that Justin Martyr in his *first Apology* (*c.* 45) quotes from the last verse, when he says of the apostles, that when '*they went forth from Jerusalem and preached everywhere*,' their mission was the fulfilment of the ancient prediction, "He shall send forth the rod of thy strength out of Jerusalem."

How many very ancient manuscripts must be represented in all these quotations! It is impossible that Eusebius's statements can be correct,—though he himself seems to have had, for some reason or other, a prejudice against the section.

Possibly, the accidental omission of the paragraph from some valuable copy, in consequence perhaps of being at the end of the codex, or in consequence of some other casualty now unknown, may be the only, and extremely narrow

foundation, on which the whole fabric of doubt and opposition has been reared. It is a fabric that must, as biblical criticism advances, crumble into dust. It was not very far that John Adam Osiander saw into the subject, when in 1753 he penned his *Vindication of the Genuineness of the Last Twelve Verses of Mark xvi*, (Tübingen); but he divined correctly when he concluded that "the Paragraph must necessarily be retained in the evangelical text." The wave of doubt, that swelled and boldly advanced for a season, must, like many similar waves, collapse and recede.

END

OF THE EXPOSITION OF

MARK'S GOSPEL.

# INDEX

## TO THE EXPOSITION OF

## MARK'S GOSPEL.


"A" or "an," *i.e.*, ane, one, 429.
"Abba, Father," 422.
Abiathar, 67.
Ability, man's, 361.
"Abomination of desolation," 381.
Abundance or surplusage, 370.
*Acts of Pilate*, 451, 452.
Ἀδημονεῖν, 421.
Ado, 146.
Adulterous generation, 247.
Affinity of spirits, 100.
Ἀγανακτοῦντες, 404.
"Age (this)," 109;—to the age, *i.e.*, to eternity, 97.
Agrippina, 169.
"Ah," 454.
Alabaster, 401, 403.
Ἀλαλή, 146.
A-Lapide, 397, &c.
Alberti, 329.
Alexander, Dr. Joseph Addison, 176, 185, 249, 268, 301, 393, 419, 445, 478, &c.
Ἀληθής, 349.
Alford, Dean, 172, 209, 403, 485, 489, &c.
"All," used in a free and easy sense, 8, 32, 34;—"all things," 219.
"All-to," that is, *altogether*, 344.
Almeh, or dancing girl, 167.
Alphæus, 86, 87.
Alternatives, moral, 75.
Altmann, 330.
Amazement, 260, 420, 465.
Ambrose, 395.
Amen or verily, 96.
Andrew, meaning of the word, 21, 85;—St. Andrew's cross, 86.
Anger in Christ, what? 75.
An-hungred, 67.
Ἀνώγαιον, 409.
Anointing, official, 2;—medicinal, 160.
"Anon," 169.
Ἀντί, 315.
Antonia, castle of, 443.
Aorist and imperfect, 222, 370, &c.; aorist and perfect, 261, &c.;—aorist participle, 230, 257, &c.
Ἀπέχει, 424.
Ἀφίημι, 322.
Aphraates, 491.
Apostles, twelve, 82;—sent out in pairs, 157, 408;—got authority over unclean spirits, 157;—the word only once used in Mark, 172;—their reverence for Christ, 408.
Apparition, 182.
Aretas, 164.
Arias Montanus, 193.
Arimathea, 459.
Aristotle, 252, &c.
Arnot, 120.
Aromas, 463.
Artemidorus, 402.
Article (the), its usage in Greek and in English, 12, 74, 80, 82, 111, 141, 180, 203, 222, 264, 270, 272, 428, &c., &c.
Aryans, 320.
"As it stands written," 198, &c.
Ass, used for riding on, 320, 323.
Atonement, 241, 243.
"Aught," 202, 233, 336.
Augustin, 97, 224, 326, 327, 382, 401, 414, 451, 478, &c.
Authorized Version, editions of, 434; primary edition of, 221;—errata in, 165, 187, 197, 238, 326, 332, 357, &c., &c.
Automatousness of nature, 117;—of the mind, 118.

Banias, 236.
Baptism, meaning and mode of, 6, 7, 9, 12, 13, 14, 194, 196, 480;—of John, 338;—of purifying fire, 311;—spittle used by Roman Catholics in connection with it, 217.
Barabbas, 442.
Barclay, Dr., 281, 319.
Bartholomew, 86.
Bartimæus, 315.
Bartolinus, 449.
Βασανίζομαι, 180.
Baskets, 178, 223.
Bastow, 378, 448.

*Battle with a wasp's nest*, 413.
Bauer, Bruno, 130, 132, &c.
Baumgarten-Crusius, 470.
Baur, F. C., 77, 147, 153, 173, 224, 244, 291, 327, &c.
Baxter, Richard, 51, 133, 200, 242, 246, 265, 276, 282, 296, 297, 346, 360, 381, 435, 447, &c.
Bazaars, 193.
"Be" for *are*, 248.
Beard, Dr., 412.
Beasts (wild) in Palestine, 17.
Beautiful, relatively, 280, 287.
Beclyppan, 274, 298.
Beds in Palestine, 43, 46, 186, 197.
Beelzebub, Beelzebul, 91, 92, 455.
"Believing" and "believing in," 20.
Belly (the), 205.
Bengel, 88, 344, 428, 479, &c., &c.;—his great critical canon, 144.
Bethany, 318, 319, 325.
Bethphage, 318, 319, 326.
Bethsaida or Bethsaidan, 172, 179, 232.
Beza, 234, 256, 265, 315, 332, 357, 377, 424, 438, &c., &c.
Bible (English), editions of, 344, &c.
Bigotry, 76.
Bill and libel, 292.
Bisping, 429, 430, &c.
Black art, 455.
Bland, Dr., 437, &c.
Blasphemy, what? 47, 97, 208, 434.
Blayney's Bible, 344.
Blazoning, 195.
Bleek, 264, 391, 438, 465.
"Bless," 177, 221, 324, 413;—"the blessed," 433.
Blindness cured, 233.
Bloomfield, 427, 462;—mistake of, 357;—overleaping difficulties, 64.
Boanerges, 84.
Boat or ship, 101, 122, 180, 183.
Boccore, 328.
Bolten, 181, &c.
Bornemann, 329.
Bos, Lambert, 328.
"Bottles," what? 62.
Bourignon, Madame, 387.
Bragge, Francis, 130, 136.
Brameld, 366, &c.
Bramhall, Archbishop, 375.
Branches used in triumphs, 323.
Brass or copper, 158.
Braunius, 434.
Brethren of our Lord, 86, 154.
Bretschneider, 269, &c.
Bridechamber, sons of the, 59.
Bruinier, 342.
Bucer, Martin, 267.
Buchanan, George, 164.
"Buffet," 435.
Burgon, 486, 488, 491.
"Buriel" (a), 171.
Burton, 266, 278, &c.
"Bush (the)," in the Bible, 357.
Buttig, 174.
Buxtorf, 368, 396, 450, &c.
"By and by," 169.

Cactus hedges, 341.
Cæsar, 352.
Cæsarea Philippi, 139, 236, 244, 251.
Cajetan, Cardinal, 156, 166, 288, 295, 327, 330, 429, 451, 472, 484, &c.
Calling, what? 57.
Calvary, 449,
Calvin, 156, 198, 199, 217, 279, 315, 326, 361, 389, 416, 479, &c., &c.
Cambyses, 401.
Campbell, Principal, 72, 272, 308, 329, 346, 367, 382, 406, &c., &c.
Camp-meetings, 221.
"Can," used of moral ability, 59, 93, 155.
Canaanites, 211.
Candles, 111.
"Cannot," *i.e.*, cannot be compelled, 270.
Capernaum, its site, 23, 272.
Caravanserai, 409.
Care, anxious, 379;—cares of this world, 109.
"Carpenter," what? 153.
Carson, Dr., 197.
Cartwright, 217, 240.
Carus, 185.
Casaubon, 193, 438.
Catalepsy, 262.
Causes, 213, 452.
Celsus, 161, 262.
Cene, Le, 262, 270, 328, &c.
Censoriousness, 67.
Ceremonial and moral, 363.
Chains, 128.
Χαλκός, 369.
"Charged" or *rated*, 81.
"Charger" and "cargo," 169.
Chaucer, 168.
Chersa or Kersa, 127.
Chifflet, 430.
Children, natural and figurative, 275, 279;—children and Christ, 297;—children and the kingdom of God, 298;—Christ's disciples so called by Christ, 303.
Chiliarchs, 167.
Chorazin, 180.
Christ, meaning of the word, 2;—divine, 3, 4;—and the Holy Spirit, 13, 15;—God well-pleased in, 14;—his temptation, 16;—as a teacher,



H

25, 29, 51;—as an anti-demonic Power, 27, 29, 129;—as the Holy One of God, 28;—as the healer of men's bodies, 31;—as a preacher, 35, 341;—his inconvenient popularity, 39, 41, 78, 81, 89, 147, 149, 172, 214, 218, 233;—his spirit, 48;—his divine power and authority, 49, 50, 155;—his lofty self-consciousness, 50, 145, 264, 307, 397, 433, 480, &c.;—a lover of nature, 51;—why he ate with publicans and sinners, 56;—as a healer, 57, 140, 143;—the bridegroom of the church, 60;—his many-sided relationship to men, 60;—generally spoke Greek, 60;—the Lord of the Sabbath, 72;—his anger, 75;—his condolence, 75;—in a boat, 79, 123; his peremptoriness, 81, 124;—and his twelve apostles, 82;—his kinsfolk, 90, 100, 155;—blasphemed as in league with Beelzebul, 91, 152;—his powerful reasoning, 93, 94, 95, &c.;—his brothers, 99, 154, 155;—his sisters, 154;—his spiritual kinsfolk, 100, 303;—asleep in a boat, 123;—and external nature, 124;—his touch, 139;—says "daughter," 143;—his authority and majesty, 147, 320;—not a mere *doctrinaire*, 149;—motherly, 149;—a carpenter, 152, 153;—a prophet, 155;—he marvelled at unbelief, 156;—his itinerations, 156;—opinions of his contemporaries concerning him, 161, 162, 238;—he blessed, 177;—he prayed, 180, 421, 422;—the cynosure of all ages, 186;—his ministry to Israel, 211, 212;—misapprehended by the people, 216;—his sympathy, 217;—'the' Christ, 239;—his relation to the various Jewish parties, 240;—the son of man, 241, 433;—his prevision, 241, 309, 393, 395, 405, 408;—must die, 241, 242, 309, 405;—and his cross, 245;—and the Gospel, 245, 307;—ashamed of the shameless, 248;—coming in his kingdom, 249, 433;—a Rabbi, 253, 310, 334, 427, &c.;—the great teacher, 255;—set at nought, 258;—he came in order to suffer, 258;—symbolism of his life, 267;—desired to be incognito, 271;—associates his disciples with himself, 278;—no egotist, 279;—a lover of children, 297;—loved the rich young man, 301;—called his disciples *children*, 303;—his seed-thoughts, 308;—a ransom, 314;—the Lord, 320;—a conqueror and a king, 323;—was he ignorant? 326, 395;—did he err? 326;—did he feign? 327;—a great speaker, 333;—his equity and dignity, 340;—his parables, 341;—the Corner Stone, 347;—true, 349;—uncompromising, 349;—David's son and heir, 364, 365;—his enemies, 365;—his tender heart, 384;—something he knows not as "Son," 395;—his twofold nature, 395;—the Shepherd, 417, 418;—a sacrifice, 421;—alone in his work, 421;—his "hour," 421;—his "cup," 432;—submissive to the will of the Father, 422;—his dignity, 433, 441, 442;—judge of the world, 433;—his relation to the Romans, 444;—the supernatural darkness, 455;—"My God, my God," 456;—and the holy women, 458, 459;—his resurrection actual, 465;—his ascension, 483.

Christs, false, 386.
Christians, "crucians," 245.
Chronology in the Gospels, 332.
Ciacconius, 168.
Cicero, 168.
Clairvoyance, 388.
Clarke, Dr. Adam, 170, 177, 216, 284, 334, 369, 395, 464, &c.
Clarke, Dr. E. D., 146, 150, 168, 354.
Clarke, Dr. Samuel, 213, &c.
"Cleave," or *be glued*, 293.
Cleophas, 87.
Clerc, Le, 329, 402, 425, 438, &c., &c.
"Clerk," "clergy," 450.
"Clip," what? 274.
Cloak, 61, 140, 187, 316.
Clyde, Dr., 372, 394, &c., &c.
Coasts, or confines, 210, 290.
Coat-of-arms, 195.
Coats or tunics, 159.
Cochran (John) of Glasgow, 387.
Cock-crowing, 181, 396, 418;—cock-crowing and Peter, 436, 437.
Coffins and coffers, 178.
Comfort, *i.e.*, courage, 316.
Comings of Christ, 249.
"Common," *i.e.*, *defiled*, 189, 204, 205.
Concupiscences, 110.
Confession, what? 9.
Conversion, 106.
Convulsions, 264.
Copper, 158, 369;—"a copper," 196.
Corban, 200.
Corn-fields in the East, 64.
Couches, 186, 197.
Court of a house, 435.
Covenant or testament, 415;—covenant, old and new, 415.

Coverdale, 333, 334, 409, 416, &c.
Covetousness, 206.
Cowles, 417.
Cowper, 230.
"Crave" and "craven," 460.
Croll, James, 394.
Cromwell's (Lord) Bible, 272.
Cross (the), 446;—a cross for each of Christ's disciples, 245;—the St. Andrew's Cross, 86.
"Crucians," 245.
Crumbs, 212.
Cups, 196;—cups containing a bitter death potion, 310, 311;—Christ's cup, 422.
Curiosity-signs, 226.
Curse, 334;—curse of Corban, 201.
Curtius Georg, 379, 420.
Cyrene, 448.

Dalmanutha, 224.
"Damnation," what? 97, 368, 481.
Damosel and damsel, 148.
Dancing, 167, 168.
Danz, 296.
"Daughter," as used by Christ, 143.
Davidson, Dr., 487.
"Day," among the Jews, 418.
Deaconship of Christ and Christians, 314.
Deaf and dumb, 215.
Death, tasting of, 248;—a lofty view of, 146.
Decapolis, 126, 137, 215.
Deceit or deceipt, 207.
Deceitfulness of riches, 109.
Decorum, deficiency in, 151.
Defilement, 204;—defiled hands, ceremonially, 189.
"Defoulen," 209.
Defraud, 300.
Degrees of ultimate exaltation, 310.
D'Eichthal, 183.
De Lira, see *Lira.*
Delitzsch, 261, 269.
"Deliver," meaning of the word, 271, 444.
"Demon," meaning of the word in classical Greek, 32;—demons, demonism, and demoniacs, 26, 27, 32, 80, 83, 127, 129, 157, 261, 269, 276, &c.;—prince of the demons, 92.
Denarius, 351, 404.
Denial of self, 245.
"Denkspruch," 204.
Denzinger, 295.
Dervishes, 10.
"Destroy," meaning of the word, 28.
De Veil, see *Veil.*
Devil, 16, 32. See *Satan.*
De Wette, see *Wette.*
Deyling, 329.
Διά, meanings and meaning, 71, 72.
Διαλογίζομαι, 47, 48, 206, 229.
Dickinson, Rodolphus, 155, 216, 359, 464, &c.
Didymus, 86.
Digamma, 451.
Diminutives, 210.
Dionysius-à-Ryckel, 248, &c.
Dipping in a dish, 411.
"Disciples of the Pharisees," meaning of the phrase, 58.
Disease, *i.e.*, dis-ease, 32, 144;—disease and Christ, 31, 37;—habitats of diseases, 36.
"Dispute," 225, 260, 261.
Divorce, 291, 292, 295, 296.
Dixon, Hepworth, 171.
"Doctrine," meaning of the word, 25, 29, 102, 199, 333, 366.
Doddridge, Dr., 462, &c.
Dogs in Palestine, 212.
Doing good, or doing evil, 75.
"Doors," 392, 393, 461.
"Draught," 205.
Drawbacks to every good cause, 406.
Dresigius, 65.
Drusius, 317.
Dumb spirit, what? 261, 269.
Δύναμις, 277.
Dust or soil, 160.
Dutch Translators, the recent, 266, 362.

Ἔα, 27.
"Ear," "hear," 218;—ears to hear, 104, 113.
Earth,—its automatousness, 117.
Earthquakes, 376.
Easter, 399.
Eating with publicans and sinners, 56.
Ebrard, 166.
Eckard, 403.
Ecstasy, 184, 466.
Edwards, Jonathan, 279.
Eftsoon, 437.
Egyptians, the, 360.
"Eight days" and six days, 251.
Elders, the, 193, 241, 309.
Elect, the, 386, 388.
Elephantiasis, 36.
Elias, 162, 238, 252, 256, 257, 258, 456.
"Eloi, Eloi," 455.
Elsner, 285, 329.
Elzevirs, the, 88, 234, 377.
Embalming, 405, 463.
"Embrace," what? 274, 298.
Ἐμβριμάομαι, 37, 405.
Emser, 399.

"End (the)," 375, 381, 393;—ends, a hierarchy of them, 314.
Ἐνεῖχεν, 164.
English Bible, editions of, 344;—English versions of the New Testament, 351.
Ἔννυχα, 33.
Ἐντρέπομαι, 345.
Envy, 155, 207, 444.
Ephphatha, 217.
Epilepsy, 29.
Epiphanius, 3, 126, 193, 429, &c.
Episcopius, 326.
Ἐπισυντρέχει, 268.
Ἐπιτιμάω, 28, 81, 124, 224.
Erasmus, 126, 192, 234, 295, 337, 382, 401, &c. &c.
Eschatology, 371.
Esoteric and exoteric in relation to truth, 78.
Estates, 167.
Eucharist, what? 413.
Eusebius, 3, 86, 139, 239, 402, 455, 458, 459, 464, 467, 471, 488, 490, &c.
Euthymius Zigabenus, 227, 242, 262, 327, 467, 471, 477, 488, 489, &c.
Evanson, 419.
Evening, 180, 410, 459.
Everlasting punishment, 281, 283.
"Everlasting sin," 98.
Evil, moral and penal, 208.
Ewald, 89, 115, 135, 173, 181, 182, 213, 362, 454, 469, &c.
Exorcism, see *Demons*.
Exorcists, 274.
Ἐξουσια, 50.
Explicit and implicit in faith, 406.
Eye, good or evil, 207.

Faber Stapulensis, 201, 437, &c.
Faith saves, how? 317;—faith has always two objects, 20;—why it is a pre-requisite, 267; faith of miracles, 335;—faith and prayer, 336;—faith in relation to prayer and fasting, 270;—the desires that spring from faith always fulfilled, 335.
Faithless, *i.e.* unbelieving, 263.
Fakeers, 348.
"Fall-up," 222.
Fame, what? 30.
*Familia*rising, 179.
"Far" and "forth," 342, 343.
Farmer, Hugh, 130.
Farmers, where did they live? 174.
Farthing, 369.
Faselt, 405.
Fasting, 58, 59, 270.
Fat or vat, 341.
Fatherland, 150, 154.
"Feared a great fear," 125.
Fenians, the Jewish, 87.
Festivities on birth-days, 166, 167.
"Fetters," 128.
Feuchtersleben, 128.
Fever in Palestine, 31.
Fig-tree, 392.
Figs' season, 327.
Figure-of-fact, 457.
Fire, penal and purificatory, 285, 286.
First last, and last first, 308.
Fishermen, 21.
Fishers of men, 22.
Fishes, for food, 176, 223.
Fishing nets in the east, 21.
Flatten and flatter, 350.
Fly-lord, Filth-lord, 92.
"Foolishness," 208.
Footstool (a living), 365.
Forgiveness, 8, 47, 98, 106, 322, 336.
"Form," 477.
Formalism, 76.
Fossils in words, 349.
Franks, 211.
Free-will, 203, 208, 422.
"Fremo," 37.
Fritzsche, 160, 176, 177, 182, 206, 257, 265, 277, 283, 303, 313, 402, 403, 469, 474, &c. &c.
Φρονέω, 243.
Fulfilled, or filled-full, 19, 178, 211, 223, 409.
"Full well," 198, 200.
"Fuller," meaning of the word, 61.

Gadarenes, 126.
Galilee proper, 173;—its populousness, 34, 35;—sea of, 20.
Gallonius, 450.
Gassner, 388.
Gataker, 284, 328.
Gaulonitis, 173.
Γέγραπται, 198.
Gehenna, 280, 281.
Geiger, 62, 63.
Gelbricht, 16.
Generalisation, 219.
"Generation (this)," 393.
Genethlia, 166.
Geneva version, 79.
Genitive of the author, 19;—of the material, 61;—of the object and of the subject, 2.
Gennesaret, or Gennesar,—plain of, 104, 185;—lake of, 20, 122;—a storm in the lake, 123;—east side of, 172, 173, 180.
George, David, 386.
Gerasenes, 126.
Gergesenes, 126.
Gethsemane, 420.

Ghost, 457.
Gilpin, W., 217, 230.
Γίνομαι, 6.
Girdles, 9, 10;—and purses, 158.
Giving to God, 352.
Glorification of God, 50.
"Gnash," 262.
Gobetis, 128.
God,—absolute and relative, 337, 360;—his infinity the sum of all infinities, 360;—his omnipotence, 306;—should get as well as give, 352;—God and matter, 183;—God and sin, 375;—God and oaths, 50;—God and Jehovah, 360;—the perfect Otherhood of the soul, 360;—God and goodness, 299.
Goesgen, 329.
Goethe, 369.
Golgotha, 449.
Good, Dr. Mason, 128.
Good for an end, 280, 287.
"Good Friday," 398, 440.
Good-ground hearers, 110.
"Good House," 409.
Goodman and goodwife, 408.
Goodness and God, 299.
Goods or vessels, 95.
Gospel, what? 18;—*Gospel of the Infancy*, 153.
Grass, green, 176.
Greatrakes, Valentine, 388.
Greek = Gentile, 211;—Greek spoken by Christ, 60, 86.
Gregory,—meaning of the name, 396;—Gregory of Nyssa, 467, 488.
Greswell, 462, 464, 473.
Griesbach, 4, 160, 210, 234, 266, 376, 411, 468, 486, 488, &c. &c.
"Grossi," 330.
Grote, 32.
Grotius, 236, 248, 284, 308, 330, 382, 425, 438, &c. &c.
Gruner, 448.
Guilt, what? 435;—guilty, what? 98;—guilty of death, 435.

Hackett, Horatio, 319, 341, 342.
Hail, heal, holy, whole, 143.
Hail! 447.
Hall of a house, 435.
Hallel, the great, 416.
Hammond, Bishop, 289, 300, 329, 403, 438, &c.
Hanna, Dr., 319.
"Haply," 326.
Hardheartedness or hearthardenedness, 76, 185, 230, 292, 479.
Harmer, 463.
Harmony of the evangelists, 53.
Harrison, 399.
Hartung of Friburg, 401.
Harvest-home, 119.
Haste in religious experience, 108.
Heal, hail, holy, whole, 143.
Hearing and understanding, 106.
Heart,—its biblical meaning, 47, 185, 199, 205, 206, 230, 360.
Hedges in Palestine, 341.
Hedibia, 471.
Heel, heal, *to cover*, 44, 465.
Hegendorphinus, 35, 37.
Heinsius, Daniel, 257, 262, 266, 328, &c.
Henneberg, 469.
Henniker, 167.
Henry, Matthew, 25, 33, 276.
Heraldic work, 378.
Herbs (garden), 121.
Herods (the), 167, 181, 229;—Herod the Great, 161;—Herod Antipas, 161, 163—170.
Herodians, 77, 229, 348.
Herodias, 164, 168.
Herodotus, 132, 164, 360, 401.
Hesychius, 467, 488.
Heumann, 208, 235, 256, 346, 402, 477, &c.
Hexapla, Bagster's, 221.
Hibernacles, 392.
Hiding on the part of God, why? 112.
Hilgenfeld, 132, 136, 142, 153, 183, 204, 213, 214, &c.
Hillel, 416;—Hillelites, 291, 416.
Hiller, 447.
Hinnom, valley of, 280, 281.
Hippolytus, 491.
Hitzig, 469.
Hofmann, 300.
Hofmeister, 155, 242, &c.
"Hold thy peace," 28.
Holtzmann, 135, 154, 213, 220, 224, &c.
Hombergk, 329.
Homoioteleuton, 404.
Honey, wild, 10.
"Honourable," 460.
Hoogeveen, 329.
Horace, 446.
Hosanna, 324;—in the heavens, 325.
House = household, 94;—the word used without the article, 41, 42;—houses in Palestine, 44, 55, 384, 435;—housetops, 383.
"How," 368, 369.
Howitt, William, 388.
Hugo de Sancto Caro, 73, 248.
Hundredfold, 307.
Hurrah, the Hebrew, 324.
Hurricane on the Lake of Gennesaret, 123.
Husbandman, what? 342.

Hyperbole, 304, 372, 381, 385.
Hypocrites, 195.

Idumea, 78.
Iken, 328.
"Ilk," 167.
"Immediately" in Mark, 24, 30, 31, 76, &c. &c.
Immortality involved in morality, 96; —immortality and resurrection, 353, 357.
Impartiality, 350.
Imperfect tense, 53, 222, 271, 333, 370, 399, 400, 442, &c.
Implicit and explicit in faith, 406.
Impressment, 448.
"In," 127, 338, &c.
Ἵνα, 258, 310, &c. &c.
Incongruity illustrated, 59, 61.
Infinities (the), 360.
Ingraham, 429.
Inherit eternal life, 299.
Inspiration, 364.
Interrogation, partial, 372.
"Into" for "in," 384.
Inward and outward, 368, 369.
*Ira per zelum*, 75.
Irenæus, 491.
Irony, 200.
Is-cariot, 88.
"Its," 392.

Jacob's *Precious Metals*, 175.
Jairus, 138.
"James and John," 22, 84, 310.
James, son of Alphæus, 86.
James "the little," 458.
Jehovah and God, 360.
Jericho, 315.
Jerome, 86, 467, 488, 489, &c. ;—the Pseudo-Jerome, 451.
Jerusalem, its elevation, 91.
Jesus, meaning of the word, 2 ;—see *Christ*.
Jews, a prolific race, 78.
John the Baptist,—his person, 9 ;—his baptism, 338;—his mission, 4, 5, 259, 338;—his imprisonment, 18, 163;—his connection with Herod, 161, 162, 237 ;—his death, 171.
Jones, Sir William, 403.
Joseph of Arimathea, 459.
Joseph, the husband of Mary, 153.
Josephus, 34, 35, 161, 167, 171, 173, 185, 200, 201, 232, 242, 276, 296, 351, 353, 357, 371, 382, 386, 398, 407, &c.
Joses or Joseph, 154, 458.
Joy, man made for it, 404.
Julian, 307.
Julias, 173.

Judas or Jude, 87, 154.
Judas Iscariot, 87, 404, 406 ;—why chosen to be an apostle? 88, 406.
Justin Martyr, 153, 276, 413, 491.
Juvenal, 178.

Καί, 258.
Kaiser, 353.
Kalmucks, marriage customs of the, 354.
Καλός and καλῶς, 198, 200, 212, 280.
Κατάλυμα, 409.
Kelly, 417.
Κεφαλαιόω, 343.
Kerioth, 88.
Kersa, 126.
Khan, 409.
K'hāwah in Arabian houses, 55, 56.
"King of the Jews," 452.
King or tetrarch, 161.
Kingdom of God, and Kingdom of heaven, 19, 249, 253, 363.
"Kitchen," 176.
Kitto, Dr., 44.
Klostermann, 179, 429, 469, &c.
Knatchbull, Sir Norton, 266, 328.
"Knavery," 207.
"Knewing," 230.
Knirschet, 262.
Κοπάζω, 183.
Koppe, 181.
Köstlin, 153, 240, 378, &c.
Κωφός, 215.
Κράβαττος, 46.
Κράσπεδον, 187.
Krebs, 90, 242, 265, &c.
Kriustith, 262.
Krüger, Sprachlehre, 214, 217, &c.
Kuinöl, 155, 161, &c. &c.
Kypke, 425.

Lachmann, 266, 454, &c. &c. &c.
Lactantius, 207.
Lamps, 111 ;—lamp-stands, 112.
Lange, 179, 182, 225, &c. &c.
Lardner, 167, 170.
Lasciviousness, 207.
Latchet, 11.
Lavater, 181, 369.
Leaven, 399 ;—of Herod, 228, 229 ;—of the Pharisees, 228.
Leaves of the fig-tree, 326.
Lebbæus, 87.
Le Cene, see *Cene*.
Le Clerc, see *Clerc*.
Lectionaries, 490.
Leek-beds, 176.
Legion, 130, 131.
Leibnitz, 278.
Lenormant, 320.

"Leorning-man," 25.
Leprosy, 36.
Λησταί, *robbers*, 333, 428.
Levi and Matthew, 51, 52.
Lexicographers, Greek, 402, 403.
Liddell-and-Scott, 268.
Life or soul, 246 ;—life lost and saved, 245.
Lightfoot, Canon, 379, 469.
Lightfoot, Dr., 54, 139, 161, 167, 175, 181, 191, 224, 251, 285, 319, 368, 413, 416, 478, &c. &c.
Limits of forbearance, 227.
Linen, 430, 461.
Lipsius, 446, 450.
Lira, De, 166.
"List" and "lust," 259.
Loaves, 175, 178, 222, 228.
Lobeck, 138, 343.
Locusts, used as food, 10.
Λόγος, what? 43.
"Look-from," 228.
Looking and seeing, 105.
Loss of life, 245.
Lots, 450.
Love, what? 360 ;—the final act of being, 360 ;—unselfish, 361 ;—in heaven, 356 ;—Christ's to the rich young man, what ? 301.
Lowliest (the), the loftiest, 312, 314.
Lowth's *Grammar*, 238.
Lubbock, Sir John, 354.
Ludolf, 10.
Lusts, what ? 110, 259.
Luther, 84, 87, 90, 198, 213, 245, 246, 247, 333, 337, 357, 389, 399, 409, 428, &c. &c.
"Lytelons," 279.

Mace, W., 272, 346, &c. &c.
Macedonian era, 167.
Macgregor of the *Rob Roy* boat, 101, 123, 132, 134, 179, 237.
Mackenzie, Sir George, 47.
Magistrates, duty to, 352.
Malan, Cæsar, 112.
Malan, S. C., 447.
Maldonato, 216, 217, &c.
Male and female, 293.
Malevolence and benevolence, 76.
Man,—what kind of being ? 361 ;—not his own End, 314 ;—the cope-stone of terrestrial creation, 480 ;—"man," *i.e. husband*, 296.
"Manufacture," 195.
Many = all, 315, 415, 416.
Mark the evangelist referred to in his own Gospel, 429.
Market-places, 187, 193, 367.
"*Markism*, a," 411.
Mary of Magdala, 458, 473.
Mary, mother of James and Joses, 86, 458, 462.
Masius, 478.
"Master" = Teacher, 124, 144, 261, 275, &c.;— = Rabbi, 253, 310, &c.
Matibalg, 158.
Matter and God, 183.
Matthæi, 160, 490, &c.
Matthew, 86.
Maundrell, 10, 287.
Maunds, 223.
Mead, Dr., 36.
Measure for measure, 113, 114.
Megaliths, 371.
Megistanes, 167.
Mehring, 207.
Μέν, 257.
Mereurialis, 400.
Μετανοεῖτε, 8, 19, 20, 475.
Metaphors in acts, 217.
Metonymy, 8.
Meuschen's *Nov. Testament. Illust.*, 296.
Meyer, 65, 142, 145, 166, 176, 177, 216, 300, 348, 465, 466, 469, &c. &c.
Michaelis, 69, 133, 161, 165, 188, 191, 216, 285, 292, 468, &c.
Michelsen, 51, 58, 65, 151, 154, 213, 327, 419, 470.
Mill or Mills, Dr. John, 209, 210, 263, 376, &c.
Mill, W. H., 86.
Mills' *British Jews*, 409, 410.
Milton, 281.
Mind, what ? 360 ;—mind and matter, 183.
Miracle, what? 277;—Christ's miracles, 226, 227.
Mishna, 201.
"Mite," what ? 369.
Mnemosyne, 406.
Mœris, 282.
Μογιλάλος, 215.
Molech, 281.
Money, 159, 175.
Money-changers, 331.
Monogamy, 354.
Monseigneur and Monsieur, 317.
Moore, Dr., 417.
Moral alternatives, 75.
Morbus Comitialis, 262.
More, Dr. Henry, 386.
Morning, 33.
Morus, Alexander, 285.
Moses, 252.
Mountain (the), 82.
Muchness, 109.
Muggleton, Ludowick, 387.
Müller, Max, 463.
Mustard seed, 120.
Myrrh, 449.

Mystery of the kingdom, 105.

Name of Jehovah, 324.
Names and thought, 275.
Nansius, 402.
Napoleon III., 323.
Nard, 401, 403.
Nathenael, 86.
Nature and God, 183.
Nazareth, 13, 150.
Necessity, antecedent, 375;—relative, 241.
Needle's eye, 304.
"Needs," the adverb, 375.
Negative, a triple, 416.
Nets for fishing in the east, 21.
Neutrality (no), in relation to Christ, 278.
New wine, 62, 416.
Newcome, Archbishop, 329, &c.
Night, 418.
"Nill," 254.
Nisan, the month, 326.
"Niss," 254.
"No flesh" = *nobody*, 386.
Norton, 182, 372, 469, &c.

"O Mirificam" editions of the New Testament, 152, 339.
Oath, the obligation of, 170;—profane oaths and God, 50;—truncated forms of oaths, 227;—oath of Corban, 201.
Ὄχλος, 202, 290, 348, 366, 368, &c.
Oehler, 360.
"Of God," i.e. *in God*, 334.
"Offend," old use of the word, 109, 154, 279, 417.
Oil for anointing, 160.
Old-Latin Version, 155.
Olives, Mount of, 319, 326, 335.
Omnipotence, what? 306.
"One of the twelve," 406, 427.
"Openly," i.e. *unambiguously*, 242.
Ophthalmic diseases in the east, 315.
Opis, 402.
Opistic, 402.
Opsonium, 176.
Oriental prostration, 138, 143.
Origen, 209, 376, 379, 411.
Osiander, 492.
"Other," i.e. *or*, 306,
Otherhood, the soul's, 360.
Ὅτι, recitative, 41, 56, 241, 248, 316, 353, 466, &c.;—interrogative, 257.
Otto, 403.
Οὐά, 454.
Οὐδέ, 347, 394, &c.
"Ought" or "aught," 202, 233, 336.
Ovens, Jewish, 410.
"Over," 416.
"Overthrew," i.e. *overturned*, 331.
Owen, Dr. Henry, 300.

Pain often penal, 80.
Palace, or Hall, or Court, 431.
Palairet, 438.
Palgrave, W. Gifford, 261, 315.
Πάμπολυς, 220.
Paneas, 236.
Parable, what? 93, 102, 204, 341;—parabolic action, 216, 217, 330.
Παρατίθημι, 178, 223.
Pardon, difficulty of granting, 241.
Particularism, 212.
"Party," a convivial, 176.
Paska, 398, 399.
Passover, 398, 407, 408, 410.
Patch, 61.
Patrizi or Patritius, 164, 259, 278, 302, 407, 414, 451, 456, &c.
Paulus, 161, 181, 270, &c.
Pausanias, 132.
Peace, 124, 143.
Penal evil a moral good, 208, 241.
Penny or denarius, 175, 351, 404.
Perræa, 78.
Perfumes, why made? 404.
Peripateticism, life a, 197.
Persecution, the heritage of Christians, 108, 109, 307, 377—381;—ecclesiastical persecution, 277.
Perseverance, 381.
Persius, 167.
Person, what? 349.
Peter,—meaning of the name, 83;—a leading spirit, 34, 239, 253;—his impetuosity and self-reliance, 418, 428;—rebuking and rebuked, 242, 243;—his successors, 240.
Petrinism, 240.
Petronius, 401.
Petter, 133, 140, 160, 178, 198, 199, 201, 205, 207, 218, 221, 225, 228, 231, 239, 248, 254, 276, 282, 284, 287, 311, 362, 378, 380, 390, 418, 424, 435, &c. &c. &c.
Pharisees, 189, 190, 200, 201, 202, 225, 348, 350, &c.;—Pharisaic notions of good and evil, 56.
Philanthropic movements, 57.
Philip, meaning of the name, 86.
Philip, brother of Herod Antipas, 163.
Philip, the tetrarch, 173, 236.
Phrenzy, 128.
Phrynichus, 180, 282.
Pilate, 440.
Πιστεύω, 266.
Pistic, 401, 402.
Plagues or scourges, 80, 141.
"Planet," what? 356.

Plato, 252, 360, 402.
Platter, 169.
Πλεονεξία, 206.
Pliny, 137, 401, 402.
Plucking ears of corn, 66.
Plutarch, 366.
Politics must be proportional to a people's development, 292, 293.
Πολλά, *much*, 39, 131, 241, 441.
Polyandry and Polygamy, 354.
Polysyllogism, 72.
Πονηρία, 207.
Poor (the), 404, 405.
Popularity, its drawbacks, 218.
Porter, Dr., 127, 150, 179, 180, 251, 315.
Possession by demons, 26, 32.
Possibility, absolute and relative, 421, 422.
Prætorium, 446.
Prayer, 33, 180, 270, 335, 336, 385;—and faith, 336;—standing the common attitude, 336;—prostration in, 421.
Preaching, what is it? 7, 378.
Pregnant phrases, 323.
Prejudice, the power of, 105.
Premeditation, 379.
Preparation-day, 459.
Pre-raphaelite style, 290.
Présent and presént, 323;—present tense, 335, 336;—presentiation, 42.
Press (wine), 342.
Pride, 208.
Priests, the chief, 241.
Procurators of Judæa, 440.
Prodigies, 226.
"Prophet," what? 155, 198, 339;—prophets, dervishes, 10;—fakeers, 348.
Proposition, loaves of, 71.
Πρός, 263.
Προσεύχομαι, 180.
Prostration, oriental, 138, 143, 211.
Providence, 293.
Psalm cx, 364.
Publicans, 54.
Πυγμῇ, 190.
Punctuation, wrong, 344.
Punishment, everlasting, 283.
Purple, a, 447.
Purse, 176.
Purvey, 134, &c.

Quadrans, 369.
"Quaintly," what? 427.
Quality, 359.
Quantitative passing over into qualitative, 39.
Quantity and quality, 363, 370.
Quarantania, mons, 16.
Quarrel, 146.

Rabbi, 124, 253, 334, 371, 427, &c.
Rabboni, 317.
Ransom, Christ a, 314.
Rascalities, 207.
"Rated," 81, 124, 242.
Reaping, 119.
"Rebuked," 28, 124.
"Receipt of custom," or customs-office, 52.
Recitative ὅτι, see ὅτι.
Reclining at table in Palestine, 53, 176, 179, 222, 400.
Recognition in the spirit-world, 254.
Reinke, 364.
Reland, 137, 172, 251, &c.
Relaxation of "positive" rules, 71.
Renan, 171.
Rending of clothes, 434.
Repentance, what? 8, 19, 160, 475.
"Reported," 134, 136.
Respect-of-persons, what? 349.
"Rest a little," 172.
Restoration of all things by Elias, 257.
Resurrection of Christ, 465;—resurrection and immortality, 353, 357.
Reuth, 174, 221.
Reverence, what? 345.
Reville, 470.
Rewardableness, 213, 279.
Rhetoric, 230.
Richard, King, 247.
Riches, 303;—what? 109;—"richesse," 24;—deceitfulness of, 109.
Righteous (the), 57.
Righteousness, as meritorious cause of salvation, 305;—as moral meetness for heaven, 302, 305.
Rilliet, 269, 328, &c.
Riot, 443.
Roads, eastern, 4.
*Rob Roy (the)*, 101, 123, 132, 134, 179, 180, 237.
Robbers, as distinguished from thieves, 333, 428, 452.
Robinson, Dr., 179, 251, 319, 320, &c.
Rolof, 328.
Roman Catholicism, its pretensions, 239, 240.
Roofs of Palestinian houses, 44, 45.
"Rooms" at supper, 367.
Roost, 121.
Rotheram, 428, &c.
Rouiere's *New Testament*, 284.
Roustaing, 393.
Rowing, 181.
Rulers of the synagogue, 138.
Ryle, 121, 277, 283, 393.

Sabbata, Sabbaths, Sabbath, 24, 463, 472;—Pharisaic views of, 67;—made for man, 71;—Christ the Lord of the Sabbath, 72;—"one of the Sabbaths," 463;—"first of Sabbath," 472.
Sacrament, what? 414;—sacrament of extreme unction, 160.
Sacrifice, 408.
Saddle, the oriental, 323.
Sadducees, 353.
"Sailing" of vessels, 195.
Saliva, Christ's use of, 233.
Salmasius, 167, 438, 449, 450.
Salome, 165, 167.
Salt, covenant of, 287;—salting, its uses, 285;—salt without savour, 287;—salted with fire, 285.
Salvation, difficulty of, 304, 305.
Salvianus, 207.
Sandals and shoes, 158, 159.
Sanderson, Dr., 170.
Sanhedrim, 337, 378, 431, 440.
Satan, 16, 108;—strong, 95;—immortal, 96;—Satan and Peter, 243;—Beelzebul, 92.
"Satisfy," what? 445.
Saunier, 69, 291.
Saved, what? 481;—or healed, 141, 143, 317.
"Savourest," 243.
Scaliger, 191, 284, 402.
Scandal, what? 279.
Scandalize, what? 109, 154, 279, 417.
Schenkel, 125, 155, 239.
Schleusner, 269.
Schmid, Erasmus, 177.
Scholten, 183, 224, 327, 419, 470.
Scholz, 486, 487, &c. &c.
Schott, 389, 468.
Schöttgen, 90, 327, &c.
Schulthess, 469, &c.
Schulz, David, 469, &c.
Scourging, 378, 446.
Scribes (the), 25, 26, 55, 189, 241, 337, 366.
Scrip, 158.
Scripture, 347.
Scultet, 402.
Sea or lake, 20;—sea of Galilee, 20.
Self, 208.
Self-denial, 159, 245.
Selfishness, 199, 305.
"Sell whatever thou hast," 302.
Semler, 131.
Seneca, 170, 171.
Senselessness, 208.
Sepulchre, 461.
Serapis, 235.
Serving at table, 223.
Seven, 473.
Severus, 467, 488.
Sexes (the), 293.
Shame in reference to Christ and his words, 247.
Shammaites, 291, 416.
Shaw, Dr., 44.
Shewbread, 71.
Shining, 252.
Ship or boat, 101.
Shod, 159.
Shopheroth, 368.
Sidon, 209, 214.
Sieffert, 270.
Signs, what? 227, 481;—wrought by Christ, 226, 227;—from heaven, 225.
Simon or Simeon, meaning of the name, 21, 83.
Simon of Cyrene, 448.
Simon the Kananite, 87.
Simon the leper, 400.
Sin, wonderful, 156;—pardonable, 96;—has an element of blasphemy in it, 97;—"everlasting," 98.
"Sinners," emphatic use of the term, 54.
Sinaitic manuscript, 192, 467, 483.
Σκύλλω, 144.
"Smith," what? 153.
Son of God, Jesus was the, 2.
Sonnabend, 459.
Sons of the bride chamber, 59.
Sons of thunder, 85.
Sore, sair, sehr, 184, 254, 441.
Soul, what? 360;—soul or life, 246;—its value, 247.
Sour-dough, 228, 399.
Southey, 304.
Sowing, 102, 107, 115.
Spanheim, 286.
Spectacular miracles, 226.
Spectre (a), 182.
Spices, 462, 463.
Spikenard, 401.
Spinsters, 195.
Σπλαγχνίζομαι, 174.
Spirit, the Holy, 12, 118;—dove-like, 14;—the Spirit and Christ, 13;—the Spirit and man, 118;—the sin against, 98.
Spittle or saliva, 233;—in baptism, 217.
Spontaneity of the mind, 118;—of nature, 117.
Sprinkling a mode of baptism, 195.
Staff or staves for Christ's apostles, 158.
Stanley, Dean, 122, 326, 459.
Stars falling, 390.
Stephens, Henry, 191, 402, 424, 438, &c.

Stephens, Robert, 55, 78, 152, 157, 171, 339, 344, 351, 454.
Stockbauer, 446.
Stoles, 366, 465.
Stone, head of the corner, 347.
Stony or rocky, 102.
Storm on the Sea of Tiberias, 123.
"Straitly," 81.
Strauss, David, 129, 130, 131, 133, 142, 166, 364, &c.
Strength, man's, 361.
Stroud, 417.
"Strown," 409.
Substitution or equivalence, 315.
"Suddenly," or *all at once*, 255.
Sue = follow, 52.
Suetonius, 167, 171, 235.
"Suffered," 139.
Sufficient, 445;—*i.e.*, considerable, 315.
Suicer, 207.
Sun, an incandescent mass cooling, 394.
Σύνεσις, 362.
Συνίημι, *I understand*, 184.
Superscription, what? 352, 451.
Syllogism, 72.
Symbolism of Christ's life, 267.
Synagogues, 25, 138, 151, 378.
Syrophœnician, 211.
Swearing, see *Oaths*.
Swieten, V., 128.
Swine, 132.
Swords allowed by Christ for a symbolical purpose, 428.

Tabernacles or booths, 254.
Table, reclining at, 53, &c.
Tabor, 251.
Tacitus, 167, 171, 235.
Talitha cumi, 148.
Take, *i.e. seize*, 262.
Tambour, 168.
Tasting of death, 248.
Taylor, Jeremy, 182, 401.
Temple, its grandeur and great stones, 371;—seen from Mount Olivet, 372;—house of prayer for all peoples, 332;—cattle and sheep sold in it, 331;—its court of the Gentiles, 332;—the court of the women, 368;—the Roman standards set up in it, 382.
"Tempt" and temptation, 226, 291, 351.
Testament or covenant, 415.
Tetrarch, 161.
"Texts" of the *New Testament*, 152, 170, 171, 189, 234, 339.
Thaddeus, 87.
"That day," 394.
Θέλω, 366.
Theophylact, 191, 248, 285, 330, 397, 402, 429, 438, 471, 478, &c.
"They" used indefinitely, 377, 390.
"Thieves" or robbers, 333, 428, 452.
"Thing" = think, 306, 422.
Thirty pieces of silver, the, 407.
Thomas, 86.
Thomas Magister, 282, 329, 409.
Thomson, Archbishop, 469.
Thomson, Dr. W. M., 146, 342, &c.
Thomson, Sir William, 394.
Thorns, 447.
"Thou sayest it," 441.
"Thought," intensive meaning of the word, 379.
"Three days," 242, 272.
Thronging, 142.
Thrupp, 368.
"Thrust," by word of mouth and manner, 147.
Θυγάτριον, 210.
Thunder, sons of, 84.
Tiberias, sea of, 20.
Tiberius, 237.
Tischendorf, 203, 222, 356, 469, 486, &c. &c. &c.
Titus, 386.
"To," denoting direction, 43.
Tombs in Palestine, 127.
Tongues (new), 482, 483.
Tophet, 281.
Touch of faith, 140.
Toup, 327.
Tournefort, 146.
Towers for watching, 342.
Traitor at the Passover supper, 410.
Transfiguration, 250 ff.
Translations of the N. T., 239.
Transposition of clauses, 328, 346.
Trapp, 47, 212, 369.
Treasury in the temple, 368.
Tregelles, 400, 469, 489, &c. &c. &c.
Tribulation, what? 109.
Tribute to Cæsar, 350.
Triclinium, 168, 176, 197.
Triller, 329.
Tristram, 124, 254, 237, 251, 252.
Triumphal procession, 323.
Triumvirate (the apostolical), 84, 145, 147, 251, 273, 310, 372, 420.
"True," what? 349.
Tunics, 159, 434, 450.
Tyndal, 299, 306, 388, 391, 399, 416, &c. &c. &c.
Tyre and Sidon, 78, 209, 214.
Twain, 293.
Twelve Apostles, why twelve? 82.
Two by two, 157.

Ululation, 146.
Unbelief, 481;—marvellous, 156;—*i.e.* imperfect faith, 268.
Unclean persons, 160, 204.
Unclean spirits, 157, 269.
Uncleanness, ceremonial, 194, 195, 205.
Unction, extreme, 160.
Unconscientiousness, 388.
Understanding, what? 363.
Universality *secundum quid*, 266.
Unleavened bread, 399, 407.
Unpardonable sin, 97.
Unvernunft, 208.
Unwashed hands, 190.
Ὑπερ, *over*, 416.
Uproar, 400.

Vat or fat, 341.
Vatican manuscript, 467, 485.
Veil, Du, 176, 278.
"Verily" or amen, 96, 248, 335, 406, &c.
Verses of the N. T., 88, 377. See *Robert Stephens.*
Verstegan, 447.
Vespasian, 235, 386.
Vessels or goods, 95;—or utensils, 332.
*Via dolorosa*, 443.
Viaticum, 158.
Victor of Antioch, 301, 467, 471, 488, 491.
Viger, 65.
"Village" and "town," 232.
Villagers, 207.
Villain, 195, 207.
Villany, 207.
Vines in Palestine, 341.
Vineyard, the Jews a, 346.
Virtue or power, 141, 142, 162.
Vision, a, 253.
Vitellius, 374.
Vitringa, 25, 138.
Vogüé, 368.
Volkmar, 81, 164, 195, 213, 223, 470, 472.
*Voluntas sensualitatis*, 422.
Vossius, 402.

Wahhabeeism, 67.
Wailing women, 146.
Wakefield, 37, 191, 200, 328, 462.
Wallet, 158.
Wallow, *i.e. roll*, 264.
Ward, Dr., 451.
Wassenbergh, 327, 464.
Watch-towers, 342.
Watches of the night, Jewish and Roman, 181, 396.
Watchful, 396.
"Water" and "waters," 265.
"Wright," 153.
Webster-and-Wilkinson, 187, 221, 366, &c.
Weiss, 470, 476.
Well-beloved, 345.
Wells, Dr. Edward, 466.
Wesley, 177, 359, 360, &c.
Wetstein, 177, 328, 371, 425, 438, &c.
Wette, De, 77, 244, 327, &c.
"What to me and to thee?" 129.
"What to us and to thee?" 27.
Whately, Miss, 193.
Whiston, 80, 283.
Whitney, 460, 477.
Whole, holy, heal, hail, 143.
Wickedness or knavery, 207.
Widows' houses, 367.
Wild-beast spirit, 445.
Wilke, 220, 231, 308.
Wilkinson, 409.
Will and wish, 422; see *Free will.*
Willes, 231.
Willibald, 179.
Wilson, Dr. John, 252, 420.
Wilson, Thomas, 110.
Winds, the four, 391.
Wine, eastern, 62, 63, 414;—myrrhed, 449; wine-fat, 341.
Winer, 402, &c.
Wisdom, intellectually considered, 152;—wisdom, wise, wissed, wist, &c., 424.
Wit, witan, &c., 424.
Withered hand, 76.
Witsius, 326.
"Woe!" what? 412.
Wolf, J. C., 326, 383.
Wolff the traveller, 10.
Wolle, 90, 328, 464.
Woman and Christianity, 179;—the women who followed Jesus, 458, 459;—wailing women, 146.
Wonder, not always the daughter of ignorance, 156, 348.
Wonders, lying, 388.
Wood, J. G., 212.
Woodman the martyr, 380.
Woolston, 45, 46, 133, 141, 328, 331.
"Word," used collectively, 423;—the word, that is, the Gospel, 43.
Wordsworth, Bishop, 182.
Work, the blessing of, 153.
World or age, 109, 308.
"Worship," what? 447.
"Written (it stands)," 198.
Wycliffe, 142, 162, 228, 282, 310, 338, 339, 352, 444, &c.
Wynne, 268.

Xenophon, 402.

Ymagion, 379, 380.
Yonglyng, 465.

Zealots (the), 87.
Zelotes, 87.
Zeltner, 451.
Zeugma, 187, 218.
Zuingli, 329, 335, 338, 372, 389.

END

OF THE INDEX TO

MARK.

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

PRINTED BY ALEX. MACDOUGALL, GLASGOW.

## WORKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

MATTHEW'S MEMOIRS of JESUS CHRIST:—a COMMENTARY on the GOSPEL according to MATTHEW. Third Edition. Price 15s.

"We have found Dr. Morison a very able expositor. He has a sound judgement, great capacity for criticism, and immense industry."—*Contemporary Review.*

"This is, on the whole, the most wise, exhaustive, and serviceable Commentary on Matthew which we have yet seen." "As an example of earnestness of purpose to represent the true meaning of the sacred writer, and of the consecration, to this task, of uncommon natural ability, great powers of patient, painstaking, and discriminative thought, and of exact and multifarious learning, the work is one of surpassing excellence."—*The London Quarterly Review.*

"Its criticisms are keen, well sustained, and never feeble or puerile; while no difficulty of text or interpretation is ever shrunk from. Dr. Morison's Commentary gives evidence of the best qualities of a scholar and a divine; and it is a work which we recommend to all theological students as giving very valuable aid to be sought in vain elsewhere."—*The Rock.*

"Dr. Morison has admirably digested and reproduced his material, giving the strong stamp of his high individuality to every portion of his spirited, fervid, and vigorous work." "The whole work is singularly free from conventionalism; it is Protestant and evangelical, but it throbs with the living pulse of strong personal convictions."—*The British Quarterly Review.*

"The reader on opening this new Commentary will speedily discover that he has found a master-mind to assist him in the study of the Gospels, and, under so good a guide, he will be eagerly turning to all the familiar crucial passages before settling down to a systematic perusal. This is no ordinary work; and when we say it is popular, we only mean that the text is in English, not in Greek, and the comment is in mother tongue too, not in interminable reference symbols, with scraps of German and Latin. But there is just as much solid and thorough work in it as though it were bristling with other tongues. We venture to say that the most important, if not absolutely all of the true commentator's virtues will be found beneath this text; namely, a fairness in encountering difficulties, fulness of research, vigour in style, critical decision which is not dogmatism, good sense, and we must not omit a knowledge of Greek. But that which increases tenfold the value of all these accomplishments is the spirit of the devout student always apparent, and the reader will not be perpetually feeling that the text above is in one dialect and the notes below in another. . . . . Dr. Morison's Introduction is very full, and worked out with masterly power, and the reader will follow it with interest all through. Here that singular ancient report of a Hebrew original of this Gospel is sifted, and some very useful observations are offered on the structure of the narrative, which he shows to be rather on a plan of memorials or memoirs than on that of chronological annals, history, or biography."—*The Record.*

"We believe this to be the best, as it is the latest, exposition in the English language of the first Gospel. The author brings to his work immense learning, a rare power of analysis, a profoundly devotional spirit, genuine exegetical instinct, and a style often rising to noble eloquence in harmony with the grandeur of his theme." "It is a noble specimen of learned, thorough, and exhaustive exposition."—*The Methodist Recorder.*

"It is a model commentary of its kind, solid, scholarly, and exhaustive, reminding one more of the books of old, than of those now produced."—*Church Opinion.*

## WORKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

"We have great pleasure in bringing under the notice of our readers this singularly able and admirable volume. It is a work that evinces throughout very eminent scholarship, sound judgement, superior skill in exposition, rare perspicacity and depth of view in seizing on the sense of Scripture, combined with aptness and force of language in expressing the meaning apprehended. The author unites great learning with remarkable powers of popular illustration, so that this Commentary, while meeting the requirements of the ripest scholars, offers much religious truth for the edification of common readers of the Divine Word. There is a keen penetration into the spiritual meaning of the Gospel narrative throughout, and a vein of high toned Christian feeling running through the whole, making it a model of what a Commentary ought to be. In these respects we know of few works of the kind at all to be compared with it, and we cannot but think it will merit a very wide circulation."—*Daily Review.*

"It is a Commentary of massive learning, exceedingly thorough, and of great ability, both of thought and style."—*The Watchman.*

"Dr. Morison's multifarious reading, his philological learning, his intellectual vigour, his philosophical acumen, his chastened imagination, his freedom from dogmatism and platitudes, and withal his reverence for the Holy Word, pre-eminently qualify him for the high work of sacred exegesis."—*The Homilist.*

"Full, exhaustive, and popular."—*Edinburgh Courant.*

"We can with satisfaction commend this volume to the student of Scripture."—*The Friends' Quarterly.*

"We have seldom dipped into any exegetical performance with more pleasure. Our admiration has been excited by the displays of learning, acuteness, and lively imagination, combined with devoutness, which mark every page." We feel that we are in the hands of an independent and original thinker, and that under his guidance we are really adding to the stock of our knowledge in things of the Spirit." *The United Presbyterian Magazine.*

"Affluent in learning, vigorous in thought, clear in perception, searching and analytic in judgement, and eloquent yet natural in style, this Commentary is far ahead of all its predecessors in the English tongue, while it is a perfect contrast to several of the muddy, mystic, and pedantic commentaries which have been flooding this country from Germany."—*The Methodist New Connection Magazine.*

"It is a credit to the scholarship of Scotland."—*The Weekly Review and Presbyterian Record.*

"*Thoroughness* precisely indicates the leading characteristic of the work. All the resources of a rich and varied scholarship, and all the forces of a vigorous, well-trained logical mind, are, page after page, from beginning to end, with unwearying patience, brought to bear upon the elucidation of the sacred text."—*The Christian Ambassador.*

"After testing it in many places, we scruple not to commend it to any who wish for a clear and full discussion of all questions likely to arise in a careful study of this portion of Scripture."—*The Freeman.*

"Dr. Morison's reading is surprisingly multifarious; his judgement is exercised with independence; and he possesses a power of clear and interesting exposition too rare among commentators. In a word, his Commentary is not only a learned, but a most readable book."—*The Scotsman.*

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.
A 8096

## WORKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

---

A CRITICAL EXPOSITION of the THIRD CHAPTER of PAUL'S EPISTLE to the ROMANS: A MONOGRAPH. Price 12s. 6d.

---

"We know not whether most to admire the depth and quality of the author's scholarship, or the spirit in which he undertakes his work."—*Christian Observer.*

"If this book had appeared first upon the Continent, it would most likely have soon found a niche in the *Foreign Theological Library.*" "It is a remarkable production of one who seems to have read and quoted well nigh all the authors that have written on the same subject. Manuscripts, versions ancient and modern, commentators ancient and modern, editors ancient and modern, —all pay tribute: and the result is one of the most comprehensive expository monographs which we have seen upon a single chapter. The author is not only industrious and learned, but he is a close and clear thinker and reasoner. It is with the literary features of the volume that we have to do, and we do not hesitate to say that such as would have all the materials needful for studying the third chapter of the Epistle to the Romans will find them here." —*Journal of Sacred Literature.*

"No competent reader will hesitate to concur in our high estimation of the theological and philological merits of this Monograph, its masterly learning, its freedom from dogmatism and cant, and its exhaustive treatment of the subject. It is in every respect a remarkable book."—*The Scotsman.*

"The work is marked by much ability. The author's erudition is uncommonly extensive. He has abundance of Greek and Hebrew learning, and is familiar with technical theology in its minutest details. Nor have his accumulated stores of knowledge weighed down his brains so that they are incapable of thinking. On the contrary, the author is metaphysical and acute. He can criticise the great masters of exegesis that have preceded him, bringing a clear intellect to bear upon their expositions, and subjecting their opinions to a minute analysis. As an example of exhaustive exposition, the volume is unique in these days. The books read by the author—Greek, Hebrew, French, Latin, German, Dutch, English—are almost innumerable. Every word and every verse are canvassed; while the opinions of many writers upon these words and verses are fairly given. Hence the book will become a sort of Index to the expositor—a kind of dictionary to which he will go when he wishes to see what has been written on a phrase, verse, or paragraph of this chapter in the Epistle to the Romans." "The vast learning, multifarious reading, and intellectual vigour of the author show that he is peculiarly gifted. In the great majority of instances in which he enters into elaborate investigations of special words or phrases, we agree with his conclusions; admiring all the while, his patient consideration and calm judgement. A scholar must produce cogent reasons for dissenting from the views at which the author has arrived through inductive processes, indicative of much labour, reading, and thought." —*Athenæum.*

"We have said this is a remarkable work. Not one theologian in a thousand could have written it. The wealth of scholarship, the analytical severity, the philosophical deep-sightedness, the truth-loving spirit, the honesty of purpose, the linguistical aptitudes, and the stamp of royalty upon the whole, will commend the book to every Biblical student whose eyes are not blinded by the prejudices of systems, and whose nature is sufficiently schooled to appreciate the highest excellences of Biblical exposition."—*Homilist.*

## WORKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

"We regard the work, on the whole, as a rare specimen of most varied research, combined with independent judgement and critical sagacity; of minute acquaintance with the opinions of others, accompanied with a severe analysis of their merits; of linguistic aptitudes united with logical power and intellectual vigour. Dr. Morison possesses a far greater number of the qualifications requisite for a satisfactory explanation of Scripture than most of his fellow-labourers in the same field."—*British Quarterly Review.*

---

AN EXPOSITION of the NINTH CHAPTER of PAUL'S EPISTLE to the ROMANS. (Price 13s.) Out of Print.

---

"SAVING FAITH:" or the FAITH, by which THE SINNER IS CONSCIOUSLY UNITED to the SAVIOUR, PRACTICALLY CONSIDERED. Tenth Thousand. Price 1s. 6d.

BS2585 .M62
Morison, James, 1816-1893.
A commentary on the Gospel according to

BS Morison, James, 1816-1893.
2585 A commentary on the Gospel according to Mark.
M62 London, Hamilton, Adams, 1873.
lxxxiii, 506p. 23cm.

At head of title: Mark's memoirs of Jesus Christ.

1. Bible. N.T. Mark--Commentaries. I. Title: Mark's memoirs of Jesus Christ. II. Bible. N.T. Mark. English. Authorized. 1873.

A 8096 CCSC/mmb